



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

A TEXT-BOOK^{OF THE} WAR
FOR AMERICANS



J. WILLIAM WHITE

H793.714.4



HARVARD
COLLEGE
LIBRARY



A
TEXT-BOOK OF THE WAR
FOR AMERICANS

A TEXT-BOOK OF THE WAR FOR AMERICANS

WRITTEN AND COMPILED
BY
AN AMERICAN

Being the Fourth Edition of
"A PRIMER OF THE WAR FOR AMERICANS"

REVISED AND ENLARGED

J. WILLIAM WHITE, M.D., Ph.D., LL.D.

Fellow of the American College of Surgeons
Trustee of the University of Pennsylvania

PHILADELPHIA,
THE JOHN C. WINSTON COMPANY
PUBLISHERS

H793.714.4



Nathaniel Thayer Winthrop

Copyright, 1915, by
THE JOHN C. WINSTON CO.

To
THE AMERICAN PRESS

Which, as a whole, from the very first days of the war has with courage, fidelity and intelligence resolutely upheld the principles of right, of justice and of democracy and has accurately expressed the sympathy of the vast majority of Americans for the cause of the Allies.

PREFACE

Very soon after the beginning of the war its literature was already so voluminous, the statements made by the warring nations were so contradictory, the accusations and counter-accusations were so numerous, the pleas of impassioned advocates were so irreconcilable, that a certain bewilderment and confusion on the part of Americans was almost inevitable.

It is greatly to the credit of the intelligence and clear thinking of the nation that, from the day England's "White Book" was laid before the world, this country as a whole—with the exception of those Germans living here, who are known as "German-Americans"—ranged itself spontaneously and with practical unanimity on the side of the Allies. But however correct this position was—and I believe it was absolutely correct—it soon became apparent that not everyone who occupied it could give cogent and convincing reasons for the belief that was in him, or could refute clearly and logically the opposing arguments and correct the misstatements on which they were often based.

As I found this to be my own case I began to set aside, or to note down, as if I were preparing for a lecture, the questions which seemed to me of fundamental importance and the answers that most impressed and satisfied me. Later, for the attempted benefit of my family and of a few friends, and for the further clarification of my own views, I threw these memoranda into the form of a series of questions and answers. In doing this I had then no definite idea of any other use of this material and in now acceding to the suggestion of some friends that the matter thus

brought together be given wider distribution I should very much like it to be understood that I do not feel that I have any special fitness for the self-imposed task. If I lay the result before readers—if I have any—outside the small circle for whom it was originally intended, it is only to try to do just for this moment the little that lies in me to help a cause in which I profoundly believe.

If the paper has any value it will not be from what I have written, but from the collocation of the opinions of others, each of whom is a recognized authority as to the subject he deals with.

Wherever my answers have involved questions of fact I have taken pains to attain accuracy. When they have related to matters of opinion I have endeavored to give the basis for such opinions. I adopted the Socratic method in the beginning because for me, without special training, it was the easiest. I have retained it for the same reason.

I beg to add finally that any proceeds that may accrue from the sale of this pamphlet are pledged in advance to the Belgian Relief Fund.

J. William White.

1810 S. Rittenhouse Square, Philadelphia.

November, 1914.

PREFACE TO THE "TEXT-BOOK"

The unexpected attention paid to my compilation and the rapid exhaustion of three editions has led me to add some chapters based on subsequent occurrences and on later writings, and to re-issue the so-called "Primer" in this new and amplified form. I have, however, tried to adhere to my original intent, which was that the book should derive any value it might have, rather from the collation and arrangement, in readable and logical form, of the writings of others, (chiefly of Americans), than from the expression of my own views.

This does not mean that I have not confidence in my views or that they are not fixed and decided, but merely that I recognize that there are very many others better qualified to speak authoritatively, and that when their opinions and mine coincide I am more effectively serving the cause I desire to help, by free quotation than by original pronouncement.

Many of the questions dealt with change from day to day in the form of their presentment to the public, but as to most of them there are underlying principles which can as well be maintained or opposed with reference to one set of facts as to another, just as specific test cases are submitted to a court, so that the decision may thenceforth apply to all similar cases. The effort to keep pace with the rapid march of current events, has precluded careful attention to literary form. Some of the matter dealt with is of necessarily ephemeral character. The desire to present important questions, or questions involving broad principles, from different aspects, and as approached from dif-

ferent sides or expressed in different language, has led to some repetition.

In spite of this, I venture to hope that as a compilation the book fairly and fully represents intelligent American opinion at this juncture, and that, for a time at least, it may have some value as a work of reference when, among Americans, the questions I have asked and tried to answer come up for discussion. With this idea in mind, I have added an "Index of Names," giving, when it is not given in the text itself, a brief identification of each person mentioned, so far as it was possible to do so. I have been compelled to omit a few of the German apologists because I could find nothing about them in any "Who's Who," or in any biographical dictionary, although I included in my search a "Dictionary of the Noted Names of Fiction."

In this edition are incorporated, in addition to much new matter, portions of a paper written in collaboration with Miss Agnes Repplier; and a brief address delivered by me before The Contemporary Club of Philadelphia.

J. W. W.

March, 1915.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

PAGE

- What evidence exists as to the real reason, the fundamental cause of this war? 17

CHAPTER II.

- What is the evidence as to the events immediately leading up to the war in their relation to the culpability of Germany? 60

CHAPTER III.

- What has been the attitude of the German Apologists in relation to Belgium since the violation of neutrality? 75

CHAPTER IV.

- As time went on has there been reason to modify or to mitigate the almost universal condemnation of Germany's treatment of Belgium felt and expressed at the outset in this country? 99

CHAPTER V.

- In what estimation does America to-day hold Belgium? 130

CHAPTER VI.

- Is there any evidence which tends to show why the present time was selected by Germany to Precipitate the war? 135

CHAPTER VII.

PAGE

What are the principles represented by the opposing forces in this war?	138
---	-----

CHAPTER VIII.

In addition to the evidence already presented as to the mental attitude of the average German toward his own race and toward other European races, are there any facts tending to show his real attitude toward America?	156
--	-----

CHAPTER IX.

What is the attitude of German-Americans toward this war and toward the principles involved?	171
--	-----

CHAPTER X.

What is the extent and what are the aims of the organized German propaganda in America?	190
---	-----

CHAPTER XI.

How much reliance is to be placed upon statements emanating from Germany at this time?	250
--	-----

CHAPTER XII.

What is the truth as to the pre-eminence of German "Kultur" of German civilization, of German achievement in letters, arts and sciences?	313
--	-----

CHAPTER XIII.

What of Russia in this war, and of the "Slav Peril"? ..	332
---	-----

CONTENTS

xiii

CHAPTER XIV.

	PAGE
What are the duties of America at this time?.....	337

CHAPTER XV.

What are the interests of America at this time?....	350
---	-----

CHAPTER XVI.

What is the effect of the official attitude—past and present—of this country on (a) Americans, (b) Other peoples?	364
--	-----

CHAPTER XVII.

From the confusing and contradictory reports from the fields of war and from other information to be gleaned elsewhere are there any indications that justify an opinion as to the final outcome of the struggle?	448
---	-----

CHAPTER XVIII.

What can America do to bring about peace?	481
---	-----

CHAPTER XIX.

What, in the light of this war, should be the aim of this and other civilized countries for the future?	495
---	-----

CHAPTER XX.

What general opinions are justified by the foregoing evidence? <i>Summary</i>	499
References	507
Bibliography	515
Index of Names	517
General Index	539

ILLUSTRATIONS.

	PAGE
Facsimile of a page from the Diary of Private Paul Glöde	120
Facsimile of a Page of "Boiler-Plate"—Matrix—Sent to American Newspapers by the German Information Service	194

CHAPTER I.

What Evidence Exists as to the Real Reason, the Fundamental Cause of This War?

a. The most conclusive evidence is to be found in the writings and teachings of prominent and representative Germans during the past forty-three years, *i. e.*, ever since the victory of Germany over France.

These writings and teachings demonstrate the determination of Germany to attain "World Power." This determination was the fundamental cause of the war. The writings in question are fairly illustrated by excerpts given below. (p. 30) It should be premised that as soon as these doctrines became widely known to the world outside of Germany and exerted their inevitable influence upon public opinion, apologists and repudiators sprang up among the Germans, or the "German-Americans." For example, to take only a few of the latter: Herr Ridder, of the *Staats Zeitung*, says (1) in reference to certain English writers:

"I am unable to come to any other conclusion than that their readings have been confined to Bernhardi and Treitschke, those two German writers who were never part of German intellectual life and were both disowned by the German people.

"As a matter of fact, Bernhardi is not even read in Germany. Of his works, published by Cotta, only 8,000 copies have been given to the public to date.

"The writings of Treitschke, as a historian, are regarded by Germans as brilliant, but Treitschke is remembered by them as a man of intense party feeling who labored under the spirit of 1870, and was incapable of true sympathy with their racial aspirations."

All the evidence I have been able to find shows the essential falsity of these statements.

Another German-American calls Bernhardt "a retired German general of jingoistic tendencies," and asks for "proof" that his book had the approval of the Kaiser. It would seem sufficient reply to him to ask for proof that it had his disapproval. In the absence of such proof it is fair to assume, in view of the Kaiser's incessant activities and restless supervision of all things German, and especially of all things military, that at least the book did not greatly displease him. Still another, Professor Jastrow, also repudiates Bernhardt as an exponent of German thought, but gives no more convincing reasons.

The following quotation from a letter of Dr. Jastrow (2) well illustrates the tactics I am considering. After asserting that at first "we" (he professes to be speaking for Americans) threw the sole responsibility of the war upon the Kaiser, he continues:

"When doubt arose as to the accuracy of this picture of a modern combination of Machiavelli and Napoleon, we discovered Bernhardt, and found that his influence, or that of the whole party which he represents, was behind it all. Bernhardt frequently quoted a man by the name of Treitschke, and, although very few in this country had ever heard of him and scarcely anybody had read him (for his works had not been translated into English), we were willing to take him on faith, and were quite satisfied that his teachings involved the conquest of all of Western Europe and of England for the purpose of spreading German 'culture'; and to this programme we added, of our own accord, the subsequent conquest of the United States."

He must, like Münsterberg (page 182), be writing to impress a peculiarly infantile type of American mind. The effort to belittle, for this purpose, the great Pan-

German historian, by speaking of him as "a man named Treitschke," is particularly characteristic.

But his whole argument to the effect that because we "have just discovered" these people, therefore we are wrong in believing that they represent Germany, is scarcely worthy of notice.

What does it matter that Americans generally were not familiar with their writings until this shocking war was begun?

Of what importance is it that we were in ignorance of their grandiose plans and sinister purposes?

What bearing on the real question has the fact that Treitschke had not been translated into English when we first began to take an interest in him? None whatever. It is not worth while to try to drag that herring across the trail.

The question remains: What *were* their teachings and what reason is there to believe that they greatly influenced German public opinion?

As to Dr. Jastrow's final sentence that "*we* added of *our* own accord the subsequent conquest of the United States," I beg to refer the reader—with at present merely incidental mention of the offensive "*we*" and "*our*"—to pages 354-56.

We are asked to believe that a former member of the German army staff, who, so far as we know, has never been reproved or censured or contradicted by the Kaiser, or by any other member of that staff, who wrote as an expert in both German statesmanship and German strategy, and whose book, published three years ago, forecast with entire accuracy the actions and movements of Germany in the present war, was "disowned by the German people" and did not represent the military caste to which he belonged.

It is not possible to believe this or to think that he was

not in full touch with the scarcely concealed purposes of the "Weltmacht oder Niedergang" party. His book was an amazingly frank exposition of those purposes and an extravagant and unqualified eulogy of militarism.

Dr. Dernburg, with the same obvious object of belittling Bernhardi, speaks repeatedly of two editions only of Bernhardi's "Germany and the Next War." The German book lists give six editions within eighteen months. In the opinion of Moltke himself, Bernhardi's father was the "Erste Kenner der Kriegswissenschaft in Deutschland." Sir John French wrote an introduction to the English translation of Bernhardi's work on Cavalry. (3)

Before the war Bernhardi's uncontradicted statements were generally accepted as embodying the views of the aristocratic caste, and in the present campaign both the German armies and the German diplomats have, even down to relatively unimportant details, followed with curious exactness his prophetic tactics.

As to Treitschke, whom many of the German-American commentators similarly repudiate, he was unquestionably one of their great national historians. Viscount Bryce calls him "the famous Professor of History." His lectures at Berlin were listened to for years by crowded and enthusiastic audiences, his teachings as to *Politik* became a gospel. Mr. Norman Hapgood (4) says of him:

"He, most of all, made intellectual Germany drunk with the idea of her so-called destiny. He taught her that all history led up to the leadership of the Teuton. . . . Germans quote him as no historian is quoted by the English or the French. In interpreting history he is their Bible. Their political thinkers never tire of him."

A similar estimate of him is expressed by another writer:

"Professor von Treitschke's rôle in all this education for war of the German peoples has been that of the man who has prostituted history in the interests of armament firms. One of his arguments is that political idealism is dependent on war, and that it is war alone that makes men realize that they belong to a definite political institution, to wit, the German nation; and since the nation really lives on account of its heroes, war is the 'terrible medicine' which prevents heroism disappearing from the ranks of humanity. In his view there can be no heroism in peace. It was Professor von Treitschke who really began, even before 1870, the educational campaign of the intellectual class, and he has been its most fanatic, as well as its most popular, exponent." (5)

Their denial of Treitschke's influence in Germany assumes, as do most of their assertions, a comfortable ignorance on the reader's part. They would have us believe that this great historian, whose seventeen volumes moulded German thought and fired German deeds, was an ordinary professor, listened to with pleasure because of his agreeable oratory, but without any semblance of authority.

Treitschke was no orator, no dealer in words. He was not in an American college, talking to boys and girls. High officials, diplomats, distinguished soldiers thronged to hear him; and on these audiences he impressed his life-long hatred of England, and his vision of Germany,—Germany dominated always by his beloved Prussia,—as the world power of the future. "I write for Germans, not for foreigners," he was wont to say; and it would certainly astound any educated German to hear Doctor Dernburg assert (in order to convince Americans of the lamblike qualities of his countrymen) that Treitschke, great and successful upholder of militarism, whose counsels have borne fruit a thousandfold, was merely a pleasant speaker,

"whose conferences were mainly attended on account of his refined rhetoric."

Powys in his review (6) of Münsterberg's book has dealt with this same attempt either to belittle or to ignore these writers. Münsterberg (?) has adopted the latter plan.

"The professor's argument is a disingenuous one. It is disingenuous in his complete omission—a surely very significant omission—of any reference to Treitschke or to Bernhardi. I am quite prepared to agree that the military clique in Germany is not alone responsible for this war. No mere clique, no mere war party, could ever succeed in rousing the spirit of a nation as the German nation has been aroused. But this matter of great popular German writers is quite another thing. I am afraid it is only too obvious why Professor Münsterberg makes no mention of them! After reading them, it is not very easy to maintain our belief in the purely pacific intentions of a Germany untouched by world-ambitions!

"Germany's pacific and industrious population had only one wish: to develop its agricultural and industrial, its cultural and moral resources. It had no desire to expand its frontiers over a new square foot of land in Europe. The neighbors begrudged this prosperity of the Fatherland which had been weak and poor and through centuries satisfied with songs and thoughts and dreams. They threatened and threatened by ever-increasing armaments.' So writes Professor Münsterberg; but unfortunately it has not been Professor Münsterberg, but much more daring and adventurous geniuses who have been the mouthpieces of the working of fate in the matter of German public opinion. The great Treitschke, a really national historian, and one of enormous genius and power—a man in every respect much more remarkable than Münsterberg's Euckens and Harnacks—devoted his whole life to inspiring the German people with his ideal of offensive war, for the sake of world-domination.

"Bernhardi, whose book has done so much to popularize these views, quotes Treitschke on every page."

Doctor Dernburg defending the militarism of Bern-

hardi and Treitschke says that it was created as "a dire necessity for the defense of our four frontiers." On the other hand, Gerhart Hauptmann, the most original of contemporary German writers, represents Germany as struggling to burst the "iron band" forged by jealous enemies around her breast, which is an ornate way of saying that she seeks to extend her frontiers, to find a larger "place in the sun." Does that mean "defense?" If not, who speaks for Germany,—Hauptmann or Dernburg? They cannot both be right, even though the now despised Bernhardi does say that "The whole realm of human knowledge is concentrated in the German brain."

The plain fact is that the longer the war lasts, and the more we read of the blundering diplomacy which preceded it, the perfidy with which it was inaugurated, the lame excuses, the contradictory denials, the insolent approvals of that blistering shame, and the preposterous "appeals" which, in terms of alternate flattery and bullying, have been addressed to the United States, the less we revere that mighty German brain, which, if full of knowledge, is correspondingly empty of wisdom.

Knowledge is proud that it has learned so much,
Wisdom is humble that it knows no more.

Dr. Dernburg has recently been more explicit as to Germany's purposes. In an article with the highly imaginative title of "When Germany Wins" (8), he has formulated Germany's peace terms, because "it might be of some interest to Americans to know what Germany would do" under the hypothetical condition indicated in his title. The article, being written for Americans (not for Germans or German-Americans), endeavors to maintain a studied moderation. The old phrase is once

more employed: "The only thing Germany stands committed to is to hold and maintain its 'place in the sun.'"

But the contemplation of the delectable feast that, "When Germany Wins," will be spread before the conqueror, brings on an involuntary watering of the mouth that causes a wolf's slaver to betray the temporary occupant of the lamb's clothing. "*As a general rule* I would not consider it wise for my country to attempt any territorial aggrandizement in Europe." "Any rearrangement of the European map that would not follow national lines *pretty definitely* would be only a source of constant friction hereafter." The italics are mine. The world knows now what to think of German promises, even when definite, official and solemn. It therefore also knows how wide a gate is left open by expressions such as "pretty definitely" and "as a general rule." Moreover, he is "speaking only as a private person and cannot voice in any way official sentiment," though he "feels sure" that he is "at one with the best German element." I have elsewhere (pp. 92, 300 *et seq.*) called attention to the number of myths and of non-existent conditions he and his fellows have "felt sure" of.

But with all these preliminaries it develops that Dr. Dernburg's ideas of the immediate demands of a victorious Germany are as follows:

"I. Germany will not consider it wise to take any European territory, but will make minor corrections of frontiers for military purposes by occupying such frontier territory as has proven a weak spot in the German armor.

"II. Belgium belongs geographically to the German Empire. She commands the mouth of the biggest German stream; Antwerp is essentially a German port. That Antwerp should not belong to Germany is as much an anomaly as if New Orleans and the Mississippi delta had been excluded from Louisiana, or as if New York had remained English after the War of Independence. Moreover, Belgium's present plight was her own

fault. She had become the vassal of England and France. Therefore, while 'probably' no attempt would be made to place Belgium within the German Empire alongside Bavaria, Württemberg, and Saxony, because of her non-German population, she will be incorporated in the German Customs Union after the Luxemburg pattern.

"III. Belgium neutrality having been proved an impossibility, must be abolished. Therefore, the harbors of Belgium must be secured for all time against British or French invasion.

"IV. Great Britain having bottled up the North a *mare liberum* must be established. England's theory that the sea is her boundary, and all the sea her territory down to the three-mile limit of other Powers, cannot be tolerated. Consequently, the Channel coasts of England, Holland, Belgium and France must be neutralized, even in times of war, and the American and German doctrine that private property on the high seas should enjoy the same freedom of seizure as private property does on land must be guaranteed by all nations. This condition Herr Dernburg accompanies by an appeal to the United States duly to note that Britain is making commercial war upon Germany.

"V. All cables must be neutralized.

"VI. All Germany's colonies are to be returned. Germany, in view of her growing population, must get extra territory capable of population by whites. The Monroe Doctrine bars her from America; therefore she must take Morocco, 'if it is really fit for the purpose.'

"VII. A free hand must be given to Germany in the development of her commercial and industrial relations with Turkey, 'without outside interference.' This would mean a recognized sphere of German influence from the Persian Gulf to the Dardanelles.

"VIII. There must be no further development of Japanese influence in Manchuria.

"IX. All small nations, such as Finland, Poland, and the Boers in South Africa, if they support Germany, must have the right to frame their own destinies, while Egypt is to be returned, if she desires it, to Turkey.

"These conditions, Herr Dernberg concludes, would 'fulfill the peaceful aims which Germany has had for the last forty-four years.' They show, in his opinion, that Germany has no wish for world dominion or for any predominance in Europe

incommensurate with the rights of the 122 millions of Germans and Austrians."

As to the Baltic Provinces of Russia, he says: "Whether these could be added to the German Empire would hinge on the question whether they could be defended." (9)

To reiterate, if this statement, cautiously prepared to demonstrate to a neutral power the extreme moderation of Germany's intentions (and at a time when the end is not within sight), is to be given any weight, let Americans imagine for themselves the probable demands of a really victorious Germany. (See pp. 24, 27, 28.) Lest it may still be thought that these are exceptional views, or that they represent only the opinion of a diplomat, I append those of a scientist (Ernst Hæckel).

Mr. Villard, (10) before quoting Hæckel, calls attention to the great need for an American Society for the Promulgation of Truth in Germany. He cites various directions in which it could be of use, beginning with the Kaiser's telegram to the King of England on August 1, 1914 (p. 73), "The troops on my frontier are in the act of being stopped by telegraph and telephone from *crossing into France*." He believes this could not have been publicly known or understood in Germany. He instances the official German despatch which reported the British army as surrounded; the ultimata sent to Paris and Petrograd at the most critical of all possible critical moments; the long article in the *Vossische Zeitung*, by Dr. Ludwig Stein, on "The Change of Opinion in America" (in which is claimed a complete reversal of our judgment on the war); and the recent speech of Major-General von Roehl, commanding in Hamburg, who, "speaking under the statue of Kaiser Wilhelm I, said, exactly in the spirit of the great Kaiser's grandson, Wilhelm II, 'We shall not again sheathe our

sharp and just sword until the last of our enemies recognizes that only one people has the right to play a leading part in the political world, and that people is the German people.” He contrasts this with the systematic belittlement—for Americans—of Bernhardt’s book and views. He continues:

“Our American society for informing Germany could have no more pressing duty than to make German editors understand that Professor Haeckel injures not merely his own high and international reputé, but that of all Germany as well, when he calmly sets down this programme as his view of what steps Germany should take to ‘reorganize Europe on Teutonic lines’ when victory is hers:

“1. The crushing of the English tyranny.

“2. The invasion of Great Britain and the occupation of London.

“3. The division of Belgium; the largest portion, from Ostend to Antwerp in the west, to be a confederated German state; the northern part to be given to Holland; the south-eastern part to be given to Luxemburg, which, thus enlarged, becomes also a confederated German State.

“4. A large number of the British colonies and the Congo Free State to go to Germany.

“5. France to surrender to Germany some of her northeastern frontier provinces.

“6. Russia to be rendered impotent by the reconstitution, under Austrian auspices, of the kingdom of Poland.

“7. The German provinces of the Baltic to be returned to the German Empire.

“8. Finland, united with Sweden, to become an independent kingdom.”

A Philadelphia paper (11) summarizes, as follows, a pamphlet published in March, entitled the “World War and Its End,” by Rudolf Martin, former German Minister of the Interior. The writer pictures the dismemberment

of Russia and France, the absorption of the Balkan States and the domination of England by Germany.

"The huge indemnity which the author believes will be demanded by Germany when she dictates peace terms in London, after two years' fighting, is estimated on the basis of war costs of 30 milliards of marks to be sustained by Germany, Austria and Turkey, in the proportion of 16, 10 and 4, respectively.

"As Germany at the end of the Franco-Prussian War made the French pay two-and-one-half times what it cost to conduct the conflict, so, the writer believes, Germany will make the Allies pay similarly at the end of the present war. In addition 75 milliards will be demanded for the support of dependents of those killed.

"The writer sees Germany firmly established along the present French coast, in a position to control both London and Paris, and possessed of an air fleet of many thousands of machines and 20,000 air-men. He sees England forced to consent to the construction of a tunnel under the English Channel, equipped with four railway tracks and an automobile roadway, at both ends of which the German forces are in control.

"Russia he pictures as completely dismembered, its territory divided up among neighboring powers, its coffers depleted to the point of bankruptcy, its menace to the German Empire forever gone. In the process of dismemberment he predicts the organization of new States.

"Sweden, the author believes, will receive Finland; Germany, the Baltic Provinces and Poland; Austria will take the entire south of Russia, including Kiev and Odessa; Turkey will receive the entire Caucasus, including the government of Saratow; Russia will have to retire both from the Baltic, the Black and the Caspian Seas.

"Serbia is to go to Austria-Hungary; Egypt to Turkey; a part of Arabia to Rumania, provided the latter allies itself sincerely with Germany, Austria and Turkey; and every other State which similarly joins this group will be properly rewarded.

"Not only does Alsace-Lorraine remain German, but Belfort is to join it once more as a German possession. Belgium not

only becomes German, along with the Congo, but is to pay an indemnity of 6¼ milliards of francs within a few years of the close of the war.

"Regarding the disposition of the colonial possessions of the Allies the writer goes into little detail, beyond stipulating that England and France must lose Egypt, India, Algiers, Tunis and Morocco as a penalty for inducing their inhabitants to bear arms against Germany.

"The Suez Canal the writer sees permanently in the hands of 'our ally, Turkey.' After the conclusion of peace, he hopes, English ships, instead of longer paying tolls into the pocket of the English-owned Suez Canal Company, will have to pay them to 'our ally, Turkey.'

"The heavy indemnities proposed, the writer frankly says, are for the purpose of so weakening Germany's enemies that it will be years before they can even contemplate war against her again. They are supplemented by taxation and a military system from the present Belgium to the new Russian border that will strengthen Germany indefinitely.

"Though Germany's territory will be greatly increased in Europe, it must be laid down as a basic principle, in the writer's opinion, that the electorate eligible to choose the membership of the controlling Reichstag must be confined to the old boundaries.

"Newly acquired Russian Poland, with its own legislature in Warsaw, may perhaps become an adjunct kingdom, with Prince August William, of Russia, as ruler. The Belgians, he believes, may also form a kingdom and govern themselves. The acquired Baltic provinces, as well as the territory taken from France, can, he thinks, without harm have their own parliaments, and live under the direction of an imperial governor general."

It would seem that doctrines and ambitions indistinguishable from those of the now outlawed and repudiated Bernhardt and Treitschke are taught and promulgated by their successors.

I have failed to find in the writings of the German apologists any evidence of ante-bellum repudiation of these

latter writers, and in the absence of such evidence, and in the light of the collateral proof furnished by the writings of others (quoted below), by the writings even of those who now seek to discredit and to belittle them, and by the circumstances attending the outbreak and conduct of the war, they must be considered as representing the views of at least that part of the German people who were intelligent enough to understand them. The quotations follow. I have used some of those employed by Viscount Bryce in a recent article (12), and have added to them from a list of my own almost as striking and conclusive:

"War is in itself a good thing. It is a biological necessity of the first importance."

"The inevitableness, the idealism, the blessing of war as an indispensable and stimulating law of development must be repeatedly emphasized."

"War is the greatest factor in the furtherance of culture and power. Efforts to secure peace are extraordinarily detrimental as soon as they can influence politics."

"Efforts directed toward the abolition of war are not only foolish, but absolutely immoral, and must be stigmatized as unworthy of the human race."

"Courts of arbitration are pernicious delusions. The whole idea represents a presumptuous encroachment on natural laws of development, which can only lead to more disastrous consequences for humanity generally."

"The maintenance of peace never can be or may be the goal of a policy."

"Efforts for peace would, if they attained their goal, lead to general degeneration, as happens everywhere in nature where the struggle for existence is eliminated."

"Huge armaments are in themselves desirable. They are the most necessary precondition of our national health."

"The end all and be all of a State is power, and he who is not man enough to look this truth in the face should not meddle with politics." (Quoted from Treitschke's "Politik.")

"The State's highest moral duty is to increase its power."

"The State is justified in making conquests whenever its own advantage seems to require additional territory."

"Self-preservation is the State's highest ideal and justifies whatever action it may take if that action be conducive to that end. The State is the sole judge of the morality of its action. It is, in fact, above morality, or, in other words, whatever is necessary is moral. Recognized rights (*i. e.*, treaty rights) are never absolute rights; they are of human origin and, therefore, imperfect and variable. There are conditions in which they do not correspond to the actual truth of things. In this case infringement of the right appears morally justified."

"In fact, the State is a law unto itself. Weak nations have not the same right to live as powerful and vigorous nations."

"Any nation in favor of collective humanity outside the limits of the State and nationality is impossible."

"War is a biological necessity of the first importance, a regulative element in the life of mankind which cannot be dispensed with, since without it an unhealthy development will follow, which excludes every advancement of the race, and, therefore, all real civilization."

"Just as increase of population forms, under certain circumstances, a convincing argument for war, so industrial conditions may compel the same result."

"Frederick the Great recognized the ennobling effect of war. 'War,' he said, 'opens the most fruitful field to all virtues, for at every moment constancy, pity, magnanimity, heroism and mercy shine forth in it; every moment offers an opportunity to exercise one of these virtues.'"

"We can, fortunately, assert the impossibility of efforts after peace ever attaining their ultimate object in a world bristling with arms, where a healthy egotism still directs the policy of most countries. 'God will see to it,' says Treitschke, 'that war always recurs as a drastic medicine for the human race.'"

"We ought to know that there is no such thing as eternal peace; we ought to have always in our minds that saying of Moltke's 'perpetual peace is a dream, and not even a beautiful dream. But war is a link in the divine system of the universe.' " (13)

"The German nation has been called the nation of poets and thinkers, and it may be proud of the name. To-day it may

again to reflect the nature of material conditions, as which it originally appeared in history." —

These conditions would be properly added to you as their authors are generals, politicians, statesmen, and princes, that such representation should to show the spirit that, whatever they have been the intention of geographical extent assumed and inspired that portion of the German people who had the power last in Germany to support the spirit which is a fighting spirit with "Deutschland über alles" and "Vaterland über Alles" as its battle cries.

Every student of Nature recognizes and observes the spirit inherent in the struggle for existence underlying the great biological law of the survival of the fittest.

But it has remained for these spokesmen of Germany to bring it to actual reality without essential change or modification, eliminating all considerations of morality, of kindness, of kindness in the world or helping of everything in fact, which serves to distinguish us from our fellow humans. There is little enough at the best, but Germany's "moral necessity" of war, like the "necessity" of poverty in the life of the German Chancellor, is simply a disguised reality in the robes of the tiger or, in the malignancy of the crocodile.

It was amusing enough, however, to find an American Professor, Jastrow, in the face of the above evidence and much more that is similar, trying to the American people:

"Let us be fair and recognize that the spirit of militarism is strong in all of the warring nations."

and then going on with the readiness that most of our "German-American" diplomats have plainly shown, to

belittle while attempting to conciliate the country of their adoption, to say:

"Even we are not entirely free of it, for does not Theodore Roosevelt voice a widely prevailing sentiment when he advocates warfare as essential to the full strength of the nation?"

The answer to which is, of course, that Colonel Roosevelt never "voiced" or otherwise favored any such sentiment, and that no sensible person ever believed it to be widely prevalent in this country (p. 240).

The distinction between the advocacy of sufficient armaments to ensure respectful treatment from military or naval bullies and the advocacy of "warfare" is so patent that the misstatement implies a confusion of thought that should much lessen the value—if it had any—of the author's labored but superficial impartiality. The real animus invariably crops out in all these "German-American" writers, and, in the present case, the "appeal for fairness and moderation" contains the statement that it was a "privilege"

"To see a great united people rising to fight, not for aggrandizement, for ports on the Atlantic Ocean, or for colonies, or eager for conquest of any kind, but struggling solely for their existence to preserve the fruits of their labors of the last thirty years."

The "appeal" also describes the readiness of "Germany" "to promise the integrity of France *and even of the French Colonies* if England would remain neutral." (The italics are mine.) It does not mention the fact that this suggestion was made by Prince Lichnowski (the German Ambassador in London) on his individual initiative and without authority from his government; or that on July 29th the

again be called the *nation of masterful combatants*, as which it originally appeared in history." (14)

These quotations could be largely added to, but as their authors are generals, philosophers, theologians, and princes, they seem representative enough to show the spirit that, whatever may have been its numerical or geographical extent, actuated and inspired that portion of the German people who had the power last midsummer to commit the entire nation to a gigantic war, with "Deutschland über Alles" and "Weltmacht oder Niedergang" as its battle cries.

Every student of Nature recognizes and deplors the cruelty inseparable from the struggle for existence underlying the great biological law of the survival of the fittest.

But it has remained for these spokesmen of Germany to apply it to civilized nations, without essential change or modification, eliminating all considerations of morality, of altruism, of kindness to the weak or helpless, of everything, in fact, which serves to distinguish us from our fellow animals. There is little enough at the best, but Bernhardt's "biological necessity" of war, like the "necessity"—to overrun Belgium—of the German Chancellor, is simply a barefaced return to the ethics of the tiger or, in its coldbloodedness, of the crocodile.

It was amusing, though irritating, to find an American (Professor Jastrow), (15) in face of the above evidence and much more that is similar, crying to the American people:

"Let us be fair and recognize that the spirit of militarism is strong in all of the warring nations."

and then going on, with the tendency that most of our "German-American" disputants have clumsily shown, to

belittle while attempting to conciliate the country of their adoption, to say:

"Even we are not entirely free of it, for does not Theodore Roosevelt voice a widely prevailing sentiment when he advocates warfare as essential to the full strength of the nation?"

The answer to which is, of course, that Colonel Roosevelt never "voiced" or otherwise favored any such sentiment, and that no sensible person ever believed it to be widely prevalent in this country (p. 240).

The distinction between the advocacy of sufficient armaments to ensure respectful treatment from military or naval bullies and the advocacy of "warfare" is so patent that the misstatement implies a confusion of thought that should much lessen the value—if it had any—of the author's labored but superficial impartiality. The real animus invariably crops out in all these "German-American" writers, and, in the present case, the "appeal for fairness and moderation" contains the statement that it was a "privilege"

"To see a great united people rising to fight, not for aggrandizement, for ports on the Atlantic Ocean, or for colonies, or eager for conquest of any kind, but struggling solely for their existence to preserve the fruits of their labors of the last thirty years."

The "appeal" also describes the readiness of "Germany" **"to promise the integrity of France and even of the French Colonies if England would remain neutral."** (The italics are mine.) It does not mention the fact that this suggestion was made by Prince Lichnowski (the German Ambassador in London) on his individual initiative and without authority from his government; or that on July 29th the

German Chancellor, when asked about the French colonies, had declined to commit himself (English White Book, No. 85); or that at about that time Germany had failed to say that it was "prepared to engage to respect the neutrality of Belgium so long as no other power violates it," although France had given an unequivocal promise to that effect. Nor does it allude to the English reason for refusal to accept the informal suggestion, namely, "that France without losing territory might be so crushed as to lose her position as a Great Power and become subordinate to German policy."

As to Nietzsche, the German apologists place a touching reliance upon American ignorance when they say that because the word superman or overman was used by Goethe before it was used by Nietzsche, therefore we might with equal justice trace Germany's war spirit to the one philosopher as to the other. If they see no difference between the philosophy of Goethe and the philosophy of Nietzsche; between Goethe's Olympian overman rising spiritually and intellectually above the foibles of humanity, and Nietzsche's bully trampling down whatever is not strong enough to resist; between the balance of perfect sanity and the frenzied revolt which precedes madness, they must be in a state of curious mental confusion. But they need not assume that their readers are equally confused. "Germany," says that too ardent upholder, Dr. Dernburg, "has waged no war of any kind, has never acquired a territory in all her life except by treaty." Good, peaceful, friendly, gentle nation! Even the little rudenesses common to less virtuous folk are foreign to her soul. "She never was aggressive to anybody." And how she has been misjudged! We, in America, thought she had annexed Hanover, appropriated Schleswig-Holstein, divided up Poland, swallowed Silesia whole, taken by force Alsace and Lorraine. We thought she was even now an-

nouncing through her War Lord the incorporation of Belgium into Germany's "glorious provinces" (p. 58). How came we to be so deceived?

Doctor Dernburg asks sarcastically, (16) "Do Americans believe all the 'official news' which the Russians are sending continuously from the seat of war as to their enormous successes?" Assuming that we do not, he then asks why we believe the "White Books," which he describes as "written for the purpose of making out a nation's case."

The comparison of British and Belgian "books" with a newspaper report would be absurd. They are plain, chronological, complete records of all the diplomatic documents bearing upon the war. But perhaps Doctor Dernburg is thinking of the German "White Book," which James M. Beck has characterized as disclosing "the suppression of documents of vital importance," and which has necessarily made no more impression on Americans than did that amazing pamphlet issued by a number of German State-owned teachers and scholars, and called "The Truth About Germany" (p. 251). These gentlemen may be the repositories of "the whole realm of human knowledge." Who shall gainsay it? But wisdom failed them in their need. They committed the fatal error of making their misstatements ludicrous.

This has been a digression, but it will serve as an example of the "fairness and moderation" of the Münsterbergs and Franckes, the Ridders and Jagemanns, the Alberts and von Machs, the Hilprechts, Jastrows, and Dernburgs.

b. But Question 1 is not yet fully answered. *Can any collateral evidence of the determination to attain to "World Power" be found in the estimation in which Germans hold their country and themselves?*

I think it can.

A little book with the crude title of "Germany's Swelled

Head," written by Emil Reich, a Hungarian, I believe, and published in London, in 1907, contains much interesting, sometimes amusing, information on this subject.

The writer quotes various authors in support of the statement that when the Kaiser speaks or writes of Greater Germany he "in all sincerity means two-thirds of Europe. He means that the German Empire of the near future will, and by right of Race ought to, comprise two-thirds of Europe." He adds that this idea may appear too childish for serious consideration, says that in all countries there have been single eccentrics who have absurdly overrated the significance and importance of their nation, and that such persons do not prove very much as to the state of mind of the majority of a people. But he insists that

"That which, in other countries never rises beyond a mere oddity is, in contemporary Germany, a vast wave of national thought. In the Fatherland, as has long been remarked by many an observing traveler or scholar, the writers, teachers, journalists and scholars of the day have an infinitely greater influence on the people than similar brain-workers ever wield in England."

He then quotes from "The Foundations of the XIXth Century," a book which he says was warmly and publicly approved by the Kaiser, and which sold largely in Germany and gave rise to a mass of controversial literature. The author, Chamberlain by name, says:

"By Germans, I mean the various populations of Northern Europe, who appear in history as Kelts, Germans, Slavs, and from whom, mostly in inextricable confusion, the peoples of modern Europe are sprung. That they came originally from a single family is certain, but the German, in the narrower Tacitean sense, has kept himself so pre-eminent among his kinsmen, intellectually, morally and physically, that we are justified

in applying his name to the whole family. The German is the soul of our culture. The Europe of to-day, spread far over the globe, exhibits the brilliant result of an infinitely varied ramification. What binds us into one is the Germanic blood. . . . Only Germans sit on European thrones. What has happened is only *prolegomena*. . . . True history begins from the moment when the German, with mighty hand, seizes the inheritance of antiquity."

Reich quotes further from the work of Ludwig Woltman, "*Die Germanen und die Renaissance in Italien*" (1905), in which the effort is made to prove that Benvenuto Cellini, Michaelangelo, Lorenzo Ghiberti, Giovanni Bellini, Leonardo da Vinci and Raffaele, were all of German birth or ancestry. He admits that this may be merely misplaced erudition, or "stuff and twaddle." His point is that it is characteristic, that it is taken seriously in Germany, and that it was gravely noticed in some of the oldest and most respectable German reviews. He quotes again the author of the "Foundations of the XIX Century," who says, apropos of the overrunning of the Holy Roman Empire by the Germans:

"We can regret only one thing—that the German did not, everywhere his conquering arm preyed, exterminate more completely," and that consequently the Latins "gradually recovered wide territories from the only quickening influence of pure blood and unbroken youth, in fact, from the control of the highest talent." Elsewhere the same writer laments that Italy "is lost, irredeemably lost, because it lacks the inner driving power, the greatness of soul which would fit its talent. This power comes from Race alone. Italy had it as long as it possessed Germans."

Reich says that Friedrich Lange, erstwhile editor of the *Tägliche Rundschau*, has gone so far as to invent and preach a species of "German religion" (*Deutsche Religion*),

and from many pulpits it has been announced that "the German people is the elect of God, and its enemies are the enemies of the Lord."

He quotes from the "Vorwärts" an extract from an oration by the theologian, Lezius:

"Solomon has said: 'Do not be too good; do not be too just.' The Polish press should be simply annihilated. All Polish societies should be suppressed, without the slightest apology being made for such a measure. This summary procedure should be likewise applied to the French and Danish press, as well as to the societies of Alsace, Lorraine and Schleswig-Holstein. Especially should no consideration whatever be shown to anything relating to the Poles. The Constitution should be altered with regard to the latter. The Poles should be looked upon as helots. They should be allowed but three privileges: to pay taxes, serve in the army, and shut their jaws" (*sic*).

He (Reich) supports his views by the statement of the Russian novelist, Dostoiewski, who writes:

"Chauvinism, pride, and an unlimited confidence in their own strength have intoxicated the Germans since the war (1870). This people, that has so rarely been a conqueror and has so often been conquered, had all of a sudden beaten the nation that had humiliated all the other nations. . . . On the other hand, the fact that Germany, but yesterday all parceled out, has been able in so short a time to develop so strong a political organization, might well lead the Germans to believe that they are about to enter on a new phase of brilliant development. This conviction has resulted in making the German not only Chauvinistic and conceited, but flighty as well; it is not only the Teutonic grocer and shoemaker now who are overconfident, but professors, eminent scientists, and even the ministers themselves as well."

"No wonder that the arrogance of the 'Elect Ones of God' comes out at every possible and impossible occasion. When Bismarck was asked what he would do should some one hun-

dred thousand British soldiers be landed on the north coast of Germany in case of a war with Great Britain, France and Germany, he replied: 'I should have them arrested by the police.' "

He continues:

"Can one wonder, under such circumstances, that the Kaiser a few years ago, at the celebration of the two hundredth anniversary of the foundation of the Kingdom of Prussia, exclaimed: 'Nothing must be settled in this world without the intervention of Germany and of the German Emperor.' "

He might have added the following:

"Only one is master of this country. That is I. Who opposes me I shall crush to pieces. . . . *Sic volo, sic jubeo.* . . . We Hohenzollerns take our crown from God alone, and to God alone we are responsible in the fulfilment of our duty. . . . *Suprema lex regis voluntas.*" (17) J. Ellis Barker. (18)

He might also have quoted Professor Rudolf Eucken, of the University of Jena, a leader of German ethical thought:

"*To us more than any other nation is intrusted the true structure of human existence; as an intellectual people we have, irrespective of creeds, worked for soul depth in religion, for scientific thoroughness. . . . All this constitutes possessions of which mankind cannot be deprived; possessions, the loss of which would make life and effort purposeless to mankind.*" (19)

Eucken has not since changed his mind. In January, 1915, he writes: (20)

"This war is not only a struggle between certain nations, but also between certain forms of culture. We are fighting for the maintenance and spreading of the special form of culture which

our nature has implanted and the whole course of our history has developed in us. . . .

"Thus it is that we have raised religion, philosophy, education, music and poetry to lofty heights. We have achieved such great things in the world because we put our soul into our work. Because we did not seek externals, but ourselves, in culture, it became for us a matter of deepest earnest. . . .

"Mankind at this point needs German methods. However much our opponents may rail against us just now, they will eventually be forced to make use of us for their spiritual preservation."

The Berlin *Deutsche Tageszeitung* urges the necessity of forcing the German language on the whole world.

"It is a crying necessity," the Berlin paper says, "that German should replace English as the world language. Should the English language be victorious and become the world language the culture of mankind will stand before a closed door and the death knell will sound for civilization."

After talking of the "moral decay" of Great Britain and the "fearful brutalizing influences and complete animalization of the human species" in "every land where the English language is spoken" the *Deutsche Tageszeitung* continues:

"Here we have the reason why it is necessary for the German, and with him the German language, to conquer. And the victory once won, be it now or be it one hundred years hence, there remains a task for the German than which none is more important, that of forcing the German tongue on the world. On all men, not those belonging to the more cultured races only, but on men of all colors and nationalities, the German language acts as a blessing which, coming direct from the hand of God, sinks into the heart like a precious balm and ennobles it.

"English, the bastard tongue of the canting island pirates,

must be swept from the place it has usurped and forced back into the remotest corners of Britain until it has returned to its original elements of an insignificant pirate dialect."

The feelings which this last amiable suggestion excited in the minds of Americans have nowhere been better expressed than by Miss Repplier (21), who, after remarking that every nation holds its own speech infinitely dear, and believes it to be infinitely superior to the speech of other and less favored countries, continues:

"Conquering races have recognized the supreme importance of forcing their tongue upon the conquered, who, in their turn, have rebelled with bitterness against this finality of defeat. For centuries Ireland has striven to preserve a language which has no longer a vital part to play. Alsace has cherished with pathetic pride and tenderness the speech she was bidden to forego. Thirty years after the surrender of Strasburg a visitor could hear no word save French in the cafés and the streets. If the rules were rigid, the defiance was invincible. German for the schools, French for the home. German for officials, French for the family. German for protection, French for pleasure. German for the stern realities of life, French for the mad hope which never wholly died.

"Some months ago a Berlin newspaper, in happy anticipation of 'der Tag,' pealed forth a prophetic note of triumph for the German tongue. Not conquered provinces alone, we were assured, but the whole wide world of civilization was destined to use this speech and be the better for it. 'On men of all colors and nationalities the German language acts as a blessing, which, coming direct from the hand of God, sinks into the heart like a precious balm and ennobles it.'

"One wonders if German text and German script are included in the gift of a too partial Providence, and if we are 'rejecting grace' by trying to elude them. One wonders apprehensively whether, since German is the tongue beloved of Heaven, we shall all have to speak it when we go there. Here on earth this 'precious balm' acts like an irritant upon men and women who are not devout enough to recognize a blessing when it is poured on them. I once spent a summer in Bavaria with a young

American girl who never forgave the Bavarians for speaking their own language. Every time she heard the hated gutturals, she would wrinkle her pretty nose and say: 'It ought to be forbidden by law.'

"As for English, 'the bastard tongue of canting island pirates,' its day has well-nigh run. Prussia, we are warned, will force it back into the remotest corners of Britain, 'until it has returned to its original elements of an insignificant pirate dialect.' The fact that corrupt variations of this dialect are stammered fitfully by 8,000,000 of people in Canada and 97,000,000 of people in the United States, need not be taken into account. We know that nothing is impossible to heaven; and if the 'precious balm' of German is going to be spilled into our hearts, we must resign ourselves to our mercies. The jargon of Shakespeare, the broken utterances of Milton, and Keats, and Wordsworth, will, in the happy years to come, be deciphered by droning philologists, who may supply a key to certain simple passages or shake despairing heads over these rude relics of piracy, these pages

'full of sound and fury,
Signifying nothing.'"

Major-General von Disfurth (retired), in an article contributed to the *Hamburg Nachrichten*, writes as follows:

"No object whatever can be served by taking any notice of the accusations of barbarity leveled against Germany by her foreign critics. We owe no explanations to anyone. Whatever act is committed by our troops for the purpose of discouraging, defeating and destroying the enemy is a brave act and fully justified. Germany stands the supreme arbiter of her own methods. It is no consequence whatever if all the monuments ever created, all the pictures ever painted, all the buildings ever erected by the great architects of the world be destroyed, if by their destruction we promoted Germany's victory. War is war. The ugliest stone placed to mark the burial of a German grenadier is a more glorious monument than all the cathedrals of Europe put together. They call us barbarians. What of it? We scorn them and their abuse.

"For my part, I hope that in this war we have merited the title, 'barbarians.' Let neutral peoples and our enemies cease their empty chatter, which may well be compared to the twitter of birds. Let them cease to talk of the Cathedral of Rheims, and of all the churches and all the castles in France which have shared its fate. Our troops must achieve victory. What else matters?"

I am not certain that, in spite of the crude brutality of this statement, it is not to be preferred to the oily hypocrisy of some of the other German defenders. For example, in an address at New Rochelle, in this country, Dr. Dernburg is reported (22) to have said: "We Germans love the French and Belgians, who were forced into the war." The American paper which quotes this goes on sarcastically:

"This explains why the British are fighting so desperately.

"Judging from the experiences of France and Belgium, only a rugged and husky nation can survive German affection. After the first demonstration of German love toward Belgium, Great Britain naturally decided that it was better to fight. Otherwise the Germans might take a notion to love the British, too.

"Certainly, if the Germans love the French and Belgians, as Doctor Dernburg says, the British can hardly be blamed for preferring German hatred, as giving them at least a fighting chance."

Professor von Leyen, writing in the *Frankfurter Zeitung*, says: (23)

"There are the neutral nations. Most of them side in sympathy with the English, Russians, and French. Most of them entertain hostile feelings against Germany. We do not need them. They are not necessary to our happiness nor to our more material interests. Let us ban them from our houses and our tables. Let us make them feel that we despise them. They must understand that they are condemned to be left out in the cold just because they do not merit German approval.

Germany must and will stand alone. The Germans are the salt of earth; they will fulfill their destiny, which is to rule the world and to control other nations for the benefit of mankind."

Professor Adolph Lasson, a German Privy Councillor and Professor of Philosophy in Berlin University, writes:

"A man who is not a German knows nothing of Germany. We are morally and intellectually superior beyond all comparison as are our organizations and our institutions."

As to the facts bearing upon this preposterous over-valuation of German achievement, I shall have something to say later, but now my object is to present a small portion of the existing evidence as to the state of mind which, pervading all Germany, did so much to bring on the war.

John Jay Chapman deals trenchantly with the subject of Germany's mental condition: (24)

"A perception of their insanity began to dawn on us in the first days of the war, when the Imperial Chancellor propounded his novel theories as to the binding character of treaties. These German doctrines chilled us. They prevented us from sympathizing with the magnificent display of German patriotism which accompanied the crime against Belgium. Soon after this the Teutonic philosophy of extermination was further revealed to us in the orders of the commanders, in the actual conduct of the troops, and also in the books about Germany which we all began to read at this period.

"We now discovered that the literature of Pan-Teutonism, which, up to this time, we had taken to be a sort of bad joke, was a very serious matter—representing as it did Unreason Enthroned.

"Pan-Teutonism had been teaching that Germany must save mankind through bloodshed. In a private person such a belief

would lead to his incarceration; but so many books are published nowadays, and everyone is so inured to extravagant arguments, that no one objects to Unreason in a book. There is a kind of squint of insanity—of the malice of the neurotic invalid—which accompanies the text in much Pan-German literature. The author passes from obvious truths to obvious contradictions without knowing that he has made a transition. The author, moreover, is more sure he is right than a sane man ever is; and when he wishes to be impressive he runs into megalomania. These characteristics of a madman, (1) unconscious passage from reason to unreason, (2) certitude, and (3) megalomania, are to be found in all the German war literature. Strangely enough, the turn of phrase and tone of mind are alike in the writings of the learned and of the vulgar. The war spirit speaks in a war tongue. Both the literati of Germany and the man-in-the-street in Germany blaze with passion and vociferate with conviction. To them their phrases are full of sacred truth; to them religion and piety, patriotism, profound thought, and holy inspiration live in the words they utter.

"To my mind, there is immense psychological interest in these exhibitions of pure, unadulterated patriotism. Their sincerity penetrates us; but the idea they convey is zero. Their message is, indeed, 'a tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing.' Such is the message of any mere race patriotism, of any patriotism which obliges the rest of the world to be subdued before it can receive the benefits of the pretended dispensation. Zero is the substance and the symbol of race patriotism. All the piety and enthusiasm with which it is offered to the world, all the gunboats and bloodshed which herald it are powerless to raise the intellectual value of this emotion above the zero point."

Prof. Ostwald, a Nobel prize winner (as a chemist), and a well-known German scientist, says (25) that the most profound cause of the war

"lies in the fear entertained by our enemies of the power, unprecedented in history, with which Germany has put into practice her great ideal of social efficiency—an ideal which

Germany by this very war proposes to realize in the future more completely than ever before. They talk of German militarism; it is possible, I admit, that the hostility which Germany is finding to-day in all parts of the world was created by the development of German militarism; but it is just that militarism which constitutes one of the most significant expressions of the German power of organization or social efficiency. Germany, thanks to her genius for organization or social efficiency, has attained a stage of civilization far higher than that of all other peoples. This war will in the future compel these other peoples to participate, under the form of German social efficiency, in a civilization higher than their own. Among our enemies the Russians, in brief, are still in the period of the undisciplined tribe, while the French and the English have only attained the degree of cultural development which we ourselves left behind fifty years ago. Their stage of culture is that of individualism; but above that stage lies the stage of organization or social efficiency, and it is this stage which Germany has reached to-day."

Treitschke said, years ago:

"Then when the German flag flies over and protects this vast Empire, to whom will belong the sceptre of the universe? What nation will impose its wishes on the other enfeebled and decadent peoples? Will it not be Germany that will have the mission to ensure the peace of the world? Russia, that immense colossus, still in process of formation, and with feet of clay, will be absorbed in its home and economic difficulties. England, stronger in appearance than in reality, will, without any doubt, see her colonies detach themselves from her and exhaust themselves in fruitless struggles. France, given over to internal dissensions and the strife of parties, will sink into hopeless decadence. As to Italy, she will have her work cut out to ensure a crust of bread to her children. . . . The future belongs to Germany, to which Austria will attach herself if she wishes to survive."

Reich, who quotes this, gives many other quotations to

support his main thesis, judgment on which I must now leave to my readers. It was as follows, and it must be remembered that it was written more than seven years ago:

"The actions of a nation like the Germans are, in the first place, influenced by their state of mind; and, given that that state of mind in Germany is now one bordering on absolute *megalomania*, or the most morbid form of self-conceit and swelled-headedness, it is safe to conclude that their actions, too, will soon assume forms of the most daring self-assertiveness and aggression." (26)

In some directions the ignorance of the German writers shared, as later events showed, by the German diplomats—is astounding.

General Bernhardi's knowledge of current history may be estimated by the fact that he assumes (1) that trade rivalry makes a war probable between Great Britain and the United States, (2) that he believes the Indian princes and people likely to revolt against Britain should she be involved in war, and (3) that he expects her self-governing Colonies to take such an opportunity of severing their connection with her!

"General Bernhardi invoked History, the ultimate court of appeal. He appeals to Caesar. To Caesar let him go. Die Weltgeschichte ist das Weltgericht—World history is the World tribunal.

"History declares that no nation, however great, is entitled to try to impose its type of civilization on others. No race, not even the Teutonic or the Anglo-Saxon, is entitled to claim the leadership of humanity. Each people has in its time contributed something that was distinctively its own, and the world is far richer thereby than if any one race, however gifted, had established a permanent ascendancy.

"The world advances not, as the Bernhardi school suppose, only or even mainly by fighting. It advances mainly by think-

ing, and by a process of reciprocal teaching and learning; by a continuous and unconscious co-operation of all its strongest and finest minds.

"Each race—Hellenic, Italic, Celtic, Teutonic, Iberian, Slavonic—has something to give, each something to learn; and when their blood is blent the mixed stock may combine the gifts of both.

"The most progressive races have been those who combined willingness to learn with a strength which enabled them to receive without loss to their own quality, retaining their primal vigour, but entering into the labours of others, as the Teutons who settled within the dominions of Rome profited by the lessons of the old civilization." (27)

John Jay Chapman, in his admirable and useful collection of the utterances of representative Germans ("Deutschland über Alles"), which he has compiled, analyzed and illuminated by pertinent and often eloquent comment, deals with this subject of German megalomania, so fully and interestingly that I may dismiss it with his remarks in his chapter on "The Genesis of Madness:"

"I will cite a few grotesque expressions from Bernhardt, because they could not have been used by a man who knew what the struggle for liberty of opinion in Western Europe had consisted in: 'There is no nation which knows how to unite so harmoniously (as the German does) the *freedom of the intellectual* and the restraint of *the practical* life on the path of free and natural development.' These be fine words; but just where the 'freedom of the intellectual' should end, and the 'restraint of the practical' should begin in each case—this is the question that has puzzled the world, and sent the martyrs to the pyre and the statesmen to the scaffold. Again: 'This independence of the individual *within the limits marked out by the interests of the State* forms the necessary complement of the wide extension of the central power, and assures an ample scope to a liberal development of all our social conditions.' This is the chatter of a parrot.

"So also is the following statement of what education ought

to teach. 'The State should teach that the mind which thinks only of itself perishes in feeble susceptibility, but that moral worth grows up only in the love of the Fatherland and for the State, which is the haven of every faith and the home of justice and *honourable freedom of purpose*.' I have italicized the words which show the feebleness of the German intellect in these fields of thought.

"The following argument could hardly have been put forth seriously in any country where argument was an instrument of government; Count von Bernstorff insisted that Germany had not utilized the Belgian route because it was the quickest and easiest into France, but had gone through Belgium only because she was forced to act on the defensive. Germany knew that some day France was going to invade Belgium; but France could wait; Germany could not wait. Thus it was really France that began the war.

"A man who had spent his youth in the debating club would not have presented such a case as this to the world; but in a tyranny there is no distinction between dogma and argument. The official view is propounded and that is enough.

"Bernhardi's books will always be valuable as the best short explanation of the war. They give the mind of the Teuton in 1914. They have done more towards explaining the disease which is now ravaging the German intellect than all the rest of German literature taken together. Moreover, Bernhardi's books will always have a specific psychopathic interest. The future student will handle them with curiosity, saying: 'Sixty-four million people once, and for a short time, believed these things.'

"The keynote of the German creed is as follows: War is the natural state of man, and 'evokes the noblest activities of human nature.' 'The brutal incidents inseparable from every war vanish completely in the idealism of the main results.' These beliefs, it should be noticed, give respectability to the German designs against France. They lend the light of conscience and religion to a crime, and invoke a great principle to cover a piece of private vengeance. The Germans, being a highly bookish and sophisticated people, require good motives for bloodshed. The Holy Ghost is therefore summoned. The sin of feebleness is, it appears, 'the political sin against the Holy Ghost.'

"In order to make it seem probable that the Germans will win in their war, the French and English are depicted as decrepit, outworn peoples, degenerate Romans, etc., whereas the Germans are the young blood of the world. The British play out-of-door games,—a sure sign of effeminacy; whereas the Germans sing, and play on the violin—sure proofs of manly endowment. The Germans are a 'chosen people' and the great men of the past have all been Germans. The most learned author of this school proves that Christ and Dante were Teutonic characters. All of these crotchets have been believed in by the illuminati of Germany, by her professors and doctors, poets, priests, and leaders of thought. Why have they been thus believed? Because they have been handed out by the governmental central authority, by the *source of opinion*. Folly, blasphemy, or nonsense, when sanctioned by the *Government*, becomes to the Germans religion. Is it not strange that this nation, endowed with all the talents but one, has been done to death by the lack of that small linch-pin—political common sense? Their sin has found them out. Their one weakness has ruined all the fabric of their strength.

"In Germany the State appoints the professors in the universities; and thus during the last thirty years of military ascendancy, only militants have been appointed. There has been no future for learned men unless they favored militarism. And nevertheless a certain ancient prestige hung about the skirts of learning which the government sought to use when the war broke out. The Kaiser, therefore, fired off all the guns of culture in a sort of parlour salute, in which incense was used instead of gun-powder. There is probably not a name of note in German letters which is not to be found at the bottom of a war-cry, or of a cry for blood and vengeance. The savagery of these literary *tricotieuses*, which has so shocked the world, comes from their indorsement of whatever is being done by the military. Thus, one reads in one column of a newspaper that the Germans have deported into Germany forty-five hundred French boys between the ages of fifteen and seventeen, drawing them from Noyon and other French towns under German occupation. One thinks of how the parents of these boys must feel; one wonders what century one is living in; one recalls the words of Bismarck, that the Prussians must 'bleed France white.' One remembers Bernhardt's remarks that France

must be so weakened that she can 'never cross our path again.' In another column of the same paper there is a passionate threnody of the poet Wolfkehl, saying that 'the war came from God'; that its purpose is 'to save the European soul,' and that its horrors are necessary. Of all these horrors the words of the poet are the worst.

"This war has been made by the intellectuals; the philosophy of it is a study-bred thing, like the new German bomb-shells. That philosophy of destruction, which lies beneath both the siege-guns and the pamphlets, is a tissue of super-sophistications, by which the old-time and gross passions of murder, theft, lust, hatred, and a certain nameless cruelty (which is new to the world and worse than all the rest), have been let loose on those nations which happen to live next to Germany. The hell of an insane sophistication burns behind this war in the German universities; and the hell of murdered women and children walk before it through Belgium. This war and its literature are all one thing. We must watch both of them to get a vision of modern Germany. When we see the total populations of cities fleeing before the advance of the German Army in Belgium, we must examine the creed of the learned Teuton.

"Crack open a bit of Germany anywhere. Doctor Lenard, Professor of Physics at Heidelberg, thinks that Westminster Abbey and the tomb of Shakespeare ought to be destroyed. The brain of a people is ignited and is burning up with the rest of the Teutonic combustibles. We can not put out either of them, but must let them crackle and give out blast after blast, till the panic is over. Then we shall be able to look about us and find out how much is left of the German intelligence.

"To recapitulate:—Germany has gone mad through dwelling on her imaginary wrongs. This came about because of the lack of political training in Germany, which left the citizen at the mercy of Government officials for his private opinions. The learned and eloquent classes thus became the tools of a military organization. The result has been an era of panic and destructive insanity of which this war is a sign."

While opinions differ as to the personal responsibility of the Kaiser for this war, it seems to me that he so fully typifies in his own character, actions and behavior, the

megalomania of the nation that it is nothing less than absurd to describe him as reluctantly pushed into the war and as struggling until the last moment for peace.

The Kaiser is in all probability a neuropsychopathic, said to have a chronic and recurring infection of the middle ear (a not unknown cause of grave cerebral disease), and evincing many symptoms of the condition known as paranoia, in which there are usually present more or less definite systematized delusions, the other mental processes remaining approximately normal. If in such case the insane premises of the paranoiac are admitted, his conclusions will often legitimately follow. If the Kaiser is Kaiser by Divine decree, by the direct appointment of God, as he has repeatedly asserted, he cannot be blamed for thinking, as he has often shown that he does think, that whatever he does is right. But is it possible in the year 1915 that a quite sane person can believe, as the Kaiser surely does believe, that he is God's special appointee—appointed to rule over and guide the destinies of sixty millions of people? I have no doubt the Münsterbergs will have some answer to that question that will—to them—be psychologically satisfying. But I defy them to answer it to the satisfaction of the American people.

That this mental condition is compatible with unusual ability, with a high degree of personal charm, with the efficient performance of work and discharge of duties outside the sphere of delusion, has been repeatedly and abundantly shown and is a matter of everyday experience with alienists.

The history of the world also presents many examples of individuals not entirely sane, like Joan of Arc, who were able greatly to influence, largely through their profound belief in themselves and their cause, the course of human events.

"The Kaiser does not believe in representative government for Germany. He does not believe in democracy, at least not for Germany. Neither did Bismarck. Bismarck doubtless believed a good deal in Bismarck, partly as the agent of the Almighty, partly as Bismarck, director of the German people. Government of Germany by Bismarck through his Kaiser was representative government of a sort, for Bismarck, in a way, was representative. The Kaiser does not believe in that. He discharged Bismarck at once. He believes in government by the Kaiser as the agent divinely appointed to govern the German people. He is not responsible to the German people for what he does, but to the Almighty. He believes—he must believe—that he is competent to judge what is right for Germany and that when he does it he has God for his ally." (28)

One of the best illustrations of the "delirium of grandeur" with which the Kaiser appears to be afflicted (and with which on account of its frequency in ordinary lunatics all medical men are familiar) is given in this very belief in his Divine vicegerency and in his constant and familiar references to God in his speeches, letters and telegrams.

The Dean of American letters, Mr. William D. Howells, has dealt so eloquently with this phase—and other phases—of the Kaiser's character (29) that I shall let him continue this answer to the second portion of Question 1—believing that the Kaiser represents in an exaggerated form (due probably to disease), the megalomania of the nation, and believing also that what Mr. Howells writes of him represents with equal truth the estimate of him held to-day by the large majority of Americans.

"As early as August 22nd the censorship of war news allowed us to learn that the Kaiser had ordered the Supreme Council of the Evangelical Church throughout Germany to include the following prayer in the liturgy at all public services during the war: 'Almighty and merciful God of the armies, we beseech

in humility for Thy Almighty aid for our German fatherland. Bless the entire German war force. Lead us to victory and give us Thy grace that we may show ourselves to be Christians toward our enemies. As well, let us soon arrive at peace which will everlastingly safeguard our free and independent Germany.'

"This carefully worded supplication must have been instantly rushed to the Throne of Grace, to the Father of Mercies, to Him without whose knowledge not even a sparrow falls to the ground, and the response might seem to have been instant, for we read that on the 25th the Kaiser wired his daughter-in-law, the Crown Princess:

"I rejoice with thee over the first victory of Wilhelm. God has been on his side and has most brilliantly supported him. To Him be thanks and honor. I remit to Wilhelm the Iron Cross of the second and first class. . . . God protect and succor my boys. Also in the future God be with thee and all wives.

'(Signed) PAPA WILHELM.'

"But in some respects this was apparently asking too much. In spite of the flattering recognition of His support of the Crown Prince. He seems to have thought it enough to be only with the Crown Princess 'in the future.' He evidently could not be bothered to look after 'all wives,' for we read that the wives of unarmed peasants and citizens were driven, with their children, from their homes in a country which Papa Wilhelm was wasting with fire and sword through a violation of its rights as a neutral nation and of his own word solemnly given, and went wandering beggared through their native land. Other wives were slain at their hearthstones by Papa Wilhelm's artillery, or torn to pieces in their beds by bombs dropped from Papa Wilhelm's dirigibles flying over sleeping towns.

"So far as 'all wives' were concerned, the Helper of the widow and the orphan was not so constant as Papa Wilhelm desired, though Papa Wilhelm had especially commended them to His care. Yet Papa Wilhelm did not lose heart, for in a telegram of the 27th we find him declaring from his headquarters on the Main, 'Confidence in the irresistible might of our heroic army and unshakable belief in the help of a living God, together with the consciousness that we are fighting for a

worthy cause, should give us faith in an early delivery of Germany from its enemies.'

"It may be that the Supreme Being, the 'living God' as the first of living men here handsomely calls Him, was perhaps not really so very hand-in-glove with the Kaiser. It may be that He did not 'brilliantly support' the Crown Prince in battle, and that it was solely 'the invincible might of his heroic army' which gave the Kaiser early victory. For Papa Wilhelm had been training them in their work of multiple murder for forty years, incessantly, relentlessly, at the cost of the best years of their youth, of their freedom, of whatever makes life sweet and dear. To perfect the pitiless machine into which he turned a kindly people he spared no means known to the art of the oppressor; he sacrificed to this end truth and honor and the love of men; he substituted the terror of *l'èse majesté* for patriotic loyalty; he made revenge and hate the prime motives of the nation which he welded into an adamantine mass, to be hurled, when the time came, against another nation which he had schooled them, in the uttermost cruelty of fear, to abhor. In this work he signed promises which trusting nations took for treaties with all the sacred and solemn guarantees, but which his ministers called 'scraps of paper' when the convenient time came. He made their commanders the terror of the men, and he perpetuated among the officers of his army the code of the duel; by his will the law of the sword became supreme against the law of the land in any question between soldiers and civilians. He turned the tide of civilization from its flow toward peace and goodwill, and drove its stream back among the morasses of the past, where it was choked with the corpses of the immemorial dead, the embers of their homes, and the ruins of their altars, so, that when the time came to destroy a peaceful city his soldiers were as ready to do his will as they were to drive the wedge of their bodies through the enemy's lines and to fall in heaps that stayed their advance.

"There is no means of telling just yet what the effect of his prayers has been with the Heavenly Father, or whether in the event they will avail against the prayers of the Belgians, the French, the English, and the Russians, beseeching the same God for victory against him. Who, indeed, always excepting the German Emperor, may declare what dwells in the will of the Almighty, or what His purpose is? Will He continue His bril-

liant support of the Crown Prince, or will He lift up His countenance and make it to shine upon the peoples who have, humanly speaking, been cruelly outraged in all that is dear to civilized men, whose lands have been overrun by invading armies, whose cities have been burned, whose fields have been laid waste, whose wives and little ones have been driven beggars into the wilderness which wanton invasion has made of their country? At the actual writing it seems as if the Creator of heaven and earth may have thought twice concerning His imperial *protégé*, and ceased to 'bless the whole German force.' Part of this force is now retracing its bleeding steps, slowly indeed, and perhaps not finally; its retreat may be merely the recoil of the wild beast for another spring upon its prey; but as yet it does not seem so, and humanity may begin to breathe again. No one except the Kaiser may guess at the unfathomable counsels of the Ancient of Days."

After describing the state of public feeling in Germany, and the generally accepted and applauded plans for her aggrandizement, another writer says of the Kaiser:

"The German Emperor's speeches visualize the ideas of the man who has the final power to say how this public sentiment and these plans shall be used; and very clearly they prove that the Kaiser feels no responsibility to any person, to any moral code, or to any ethical ideal. He is the final arbiter.

"That the Emperor William II has always anticipated the world-war which is now waging—is more than proved by the extracts from His Majesty's speeches. His very first official act upon coming to the throne was to issue an edict to the German army, and it was not until some days after that he issued a proclamation 'To my people.' To him the soldier is far more important than the civilian. Votes and elections count for nothing.

"The German Emperor's speeches are voluminous. They have appeared in Germany in various forms and run to several volumes. The selections here given have not been deliberately picked out for the purpose of showing that the Kaiser has assumed the leadership of the war mania movement. It would

have been impossible to have made any selection which would not have pointed in the same direction.

The idea of war is ever in His Majesty's mind, even when he is addressing himself to purely pacific matters. The dove of peace is always mated with the German eagle. His Majesty cannot unveil a civic monument without referring to the military glory of his ancestors. He cannot address an educational conference without emphasizing that in his opinion the best kind of education is that which leads the youth of Germany to contemplate the military achievements of their forefathers. He cannot pay a compliment to the ruler of another State without at the same time referring to the bravery and chivalry of the other monarch's military forces. He cannot even preach a sermon without referring to the military exploits of the ancient Hebrews; and he cannot even pray without calling upon the Lord of Hosts to lead the German army to victory." (30)

The Kaiser set on foot the decoration of the "Avenue of Victory" at Berlin, drew up the general plan, and personally selected the artists who sculptured the various groups. At a dinner to which these artists were invited, the Kaiser said:

"As I proclaimed on a former occasion, I, too, regard it as my mission, in conformity with the ideas of my parents, to stretch my hand over my German people and its rising generation; to foster the beautiful; to develop art in the life of the people; but only in fixed lines and within those strictly defined limits which are to be found in the sense of mankind for beauty and harmony." (January, 1902.) (31)

"The great ideals have become for us Germans a permanent possession, while other nations have more or less lost them. The German nation is now the only people left which is called upon in the first place to protect and cultivate and promote these great ideals" (32)

Speaking at a banquet of the Provincial Diet of Brandenburg, in February, 1892, the Kaiser said:

"The firm conviction of your sympathy in my labours gives me renewed strength to persist in my work, and to press forward on the path which Heaven has laid out for me. I am helped thereto by my feeling of responsibility to the Ruler of All, and the firm conviction that He, our ally of Rossbach and Dennewitz, will not leave me in the lurch. He has given Himself such endless trouble with our old Mark and with our House that we can assume that He has not done this for nothing.

"The august figure of our great Emperor William the First, who has passed from among us, is always present with us, together with his mighty deeds. How were these accomplished? Through the unshakable belief held by my grandfather in the mission intrusted to him by God, which he combined with an untiring zeal for duty. He was supported by the Mark and entire German Fatherland. Amid these traditions I have grown up and in them I was reared by him. I also have the same belief." (At the annual dinner of the Diet of Brandenburg, March, 1893.) (33)

"May the might of Germany become as firm and as powerful as was once that of the Roman world-empire, so that in the future 'I am a German citizen' may be uttered with the same pride as was the ancient 'Civis Romanus sum.'" (Saltzburg, 1900.) (34)

It seems unnecessary to multiply evidence that the Kaiser has a form of megalomania that amounts to disease, or that he, unfortunately, in this respect, represents with fair accuracy, the present frame of mind—probably only temporary—of the German nation.

But I shall add one additional bit of testimony, just at hand. It may be untrustworthy, but it has the earmarks of genuineness.

An order issued by "Papa Wilhelm" to his troops in East Prussia is said (35) to read in part as follows:

"Thanks to the valor of my heroes, France has been severely punished. Belgium, which interfered with our attack, has been added to the glorious provinces of Germany. From the course

of military events you know that the punitive expedition into Russia has also been a brilliant success.

"My heroes, the hour of trial has now come for you and for the whole of Germany. If Germany is dear to you—if your families are dear to you—if your culture, your faith, your nation, your Emperor, are dear to you, you will offer the enemy worthy resistance."

I ask the reader to note the crescendo—from "Germany" through "families," "culture," "faith," and the "nation" up to the "Emperor!" Also the announced addition of Belgium to the "glorious provinces of Germany."

The Kaiser may not have written this, but, if he didn't, the author takes rank with Chatterton. There is a "condensed novel" in those paragraphs worthy of Bret Harte or Leacock.

But, after all, the question of the exact mental condition of the Kaiser is not of fundamental importance. His power is unquestioned, his leadership indisputable. He stands to-day before the world as the embodiment of the spirit of the school of the Bernhardis and Treitschkes. He is the apotheosis of the Münsterberg idea of an Emperor as "the symbol of the State."

The world believes that had he so willed this war would not have occurred. Whether his will to war was, however indefensible and brutal, a sanely reasoned determination, or the irresistible impulse of a mental defective the world may never know. As I have said, *now* it is not important.

CHAPTER II.

What is the Evidence as to the Events Immediately Leading up to the War in Their Relation to the Culpability of Germany?

As I was trying to formulate my ideas in reply to this question, there appeared in the public press (36) a most illuminating and convincing article from the pen of one of the leaders of the American Bar, Mr. James M. Beck. He propounds, at the outset, three questions: Was Austria justified in declaring war against Serbia? Was Germany justified in declaring war against Russia and France? Was England justified in declaring war against Germany?

He reviews in a masterly manner all the official and documentary evidence now before the world, and assumes that it is to be presented to a "Supreme Court of Civilization" for consideration and judgment.

In reply to the last of these questions he cites the solemn treaty of 1839, whereby Prussia, France, England, Austria and Russia "became the guarantors" of the "perpetual neutrality" of Belgium, which treaty was reaffirmed by Count Bismarck, then Chancellor of the German Empire, on July 22, 1870, and even more recently (1913) by the German Secretary of State, who said in the Reichstag:

"The neutrality of Belgium is determined by international conventions, and Germany is resolved to respect these conventions."

To confirm this solemn assurance, the Minister of War added in the same debate:

"Belgium does not play any part in the justification of the German scheme of military reorganization. The scheme is justified by the position of matters in the East. *Germany will not lose sight of the fact that Belgium neutrality is guaranteed by international treaties.*"

A year later, on July 31, 1914, Herr von Buelow, the German Minister at Brussels, assured the Belgian Department of State that he knew of a declaration which the German Chancellor had made in 1911 to the effect "that Germany had no intention of violating our (Belgium's) neutrality," and "that he was certain that the sentiments to which expression was given at that time *had not changed.*" (See Belgian "Gray Book," Nos. 11 and 12.)

Mr. Beck says it seems unnecessary to discuss the wanton disregard of these solemn obligations and protestations, when the present Chancellor of the German Empire, in his speech to the Reichstag and to the world on August 4, 1914, frankly admitted that the action of the German military machine in invading Belgium was a wrong. He said:

"We are now in a state of necessity, and necessity knows no law. Our troops have occupied Luxemburg and perhaps are already on Belgian soil. *Gentlemen, that is contrary to the dictates of international law. . . . The wrong—I speak openly—that we are committing* we will endeavor to make good as soon as our military goal has been reached. Anybody who is threatened as we are threatened, and is fighting for his highest possessions, can only have one thought—*how he is to hack his way through.*"

Mr. Beck might have added that by this same treaty Belgium had pledged herself to *resist* any violation of her neutrality, and that it was not only her right but her duty to bar the way to the march of Germany's legions across the land. Mr. Beck continues as to the German Chancellor's

"defence" by saying that it is not even a plea of confession and avoidance. It is a plea of "Guilty" at the bar of the world. It has one merit—that it does not add to the crime the aggravation of hypocrisy. It virtually rests the case of Germany upon the Gospel of Treitschke and Bernhardi, which was taught far more effectively by Machiavelli in his treatise, "The Prince," wherein he glorified the policy of Cesare Borgia in trampling the weaker States of Italy under foot by ruthless terrorism, unbridled ferocity and the basest deception. The wanton destruction of Belgium is simply Borgiaism amplified ten thousand fold by the mechanical resources of modern war.

As to this point, Mr. Beck concludes that unless our boasted civilization is the thinnest veneering of barbarism; unless the law of the world is in fact only the ethics of the rifle and the conscience of the cannon; unless mankind after uncounted centuries has made no real advance in political morality beyond that of the cave dweller, then this answer of Germany fails to show a "decent respect to the opinions of mankind." Germany's contention that a treaty of peace is "a scrap of paper," to be disregarded at will when required by the selfish interests of one contracting party, is the negation of all that civilization stands for.

"Belgium has been crucified in the face of the world. Its innocence of any offense, until it was attacked, is too clear for argument. Its voluntary immolation to preserve its solemn guarantee of neutrality will 'plead like angels, trumpet-tongued, against the deep damnation of its taking off.' On that issue the Supreme Court could have no ground for doubt or hesitation. Its judgment would be speedy and inexorable."

Mr. Beck then goes on to discuss the evidence offered to the public in the British and German "White Papers" and the "Russian Orange Paper," and asks what verdict an

impartial and dispassionate court would render upon the issues thus raised and the evidence thus submitted. He says:

"Primarily such a court would be deeply impressed, not only by what the record as thus made up discloses, *but also by the significant omissions of documents known to be in existence.*

"The official defense of England and Russia does not apparently show any failure on the part of either to submit all of the documents in their possession, *but the German 'White Paper' on its face discloses the suppression of documents of vital importance, while Austria has as yet failed to submit any of the documentary evidence in its possession.*

"We know from the German 'White Paper'—even if we did not conclude as a matter of irresistible inference—that many important communications passed in this crisis between Germany and Austria, and it is probable that some communications must also have passed between those two countries and Italy. Italy, despite its embarrassing position, owes to the world the duty of a full disclosure. What such disclosure would probably show is indicated by her deliberate conclusion that her allies had commenced an *aggressive* war, which released her from any obligation under the Triple Alliance."

His conclusion as to this point is that until Germany is willing to put in evidence the most important documents in its possession, it must not be surprised that the world, remembering Bismarck's garbling of the Ems dispatch, which precipitated the Franco-Prussian war, will be incredulous as to the sincerity of Germany's mediatory efforts.

He then reviews the entire diplomatic correspondence, as published, repeatedly calling attention to the absence of important documents from the German and Austrian records. He finds that those two nations were guilty, not only of concealment or suppression of portions of the record, while Germany was pretending to lay its case unreservedly before the world, but that they were "diplomatic pettifoggers" who took a "colossal snap judgment"; that the German

Secretary of State was guilty of a "plain evasion"; the German Imperial Chancellor of a "pitiful and insincere quibble"; of "hypocrisy," of "arrogance" and "unreasonableness." Of one contention of the German Secretary of State, that Austria might act in disregard of Germany's wish in a matter of common concern, he says:

"This strains human credulity to the breaking point. Did the German Secretary of State keep up a straight face when he uttered this sardonic pleasantry? It may be the duty of a diplomat to lie on occasion, but is it ever necessary to utter such a stupid falsehood? The German Secretary of State sardonically added in the same conversation, that he was not sure that the effort for peace had not hastened the declaration of war; as though the declaration of war against Serbia had not been planned and expected from the first."

Mr. Beck does not fail to call attention to the fact that—

"In reaching its conclusion our imaginary court would pay little attention to mere professions of a desire for peace. . . ."

"No war in modern times has been begun without the aggressor pretending that his nation wished nothing but peace, and invoking Divine aid for its murderous policy. To paraphrase the words of Lady Teazle on a noted occasion, when Sir Joseph Surface talked much of 'honor,' it might be as well in such instances to leave the name of God out of the question."

The Judgment of the Court he says would be unhesitatingly as follows:

"1. That Germany and Austria in a time of profound peace secretly concerted together to impose their will upon Europe and upon Serbia in a matter affecting the balance of power in Europe. Whether in so doing they intended to precipitate a European war to determine the mastery of Europe is not satisfactorily established, although their whole course of conduct suggests this as a possibility. They made war almost inevitable by

(a) issuing an ultimatum that was grossly unreasonable and disproportionate to any grievance that Austria had, and (b) in giving to Serbia, and Europe, insufficient time to consider the rights and obligations of all interested nations.

"2. That Germany had at all times the power to compel Austria to preserve a reasonable and conciliatory course, but at no time effectively exerted that influence. On the contrary, she certainly abetted, and possibly instigated, Austria in its unreasonable course.

"3. That England, France, Italy and Russia at all times sincerely worked for peace, and for this purpose not only overlooked the original misconduct of Austria, but made every reasonable concession in the hope of preserving peace.

"4. That Austria, having mobilized its army, Russia was reasonably justified in mobilizing its forces. Such act of mobilization was the right of any sovereign State, and as long as the Russian armies did not cross the border or take any aggressive action no other nation had any just right to complain, each having the same right to make similar preparations.

"5. That Germany, in abruptly declaring war against Russia for failure to demobilize when the other Powers had offered to make any reasonable concession and peace parleys were still in progress, precipitated the war."

He adds that—

"The German nation has been plunged into this abyss by its scheming statesmen and its self-centered and highly neurotic Kaiser, who in the twentieth century sincerely believes that he is the proxy of Almighty God on earth, and therefore infallible."

Since his article appeared, another labored defence of Germany has been sent to America, and, fathered by Dr. Bernhard Dernburg, at one time the German Colonial Secretary, and said to be "now Germany's most conspicuous advocate in the United States," has been given to the American press. It still further illustrates many of the

points already made. For example, it speaks again of the mythical French attack upon Germany across Belgium, resting the assertion "upon absolutely unimpeachable information," which it does not give. Such attempts as have been made to sustain this eleventh-hour defence are, so far as I have seen, like many of those in the German "White Paper," based on similarly vague and unsupported statements. The whole effort in this last lengthy and involved document is to try to show that Russia is "responsible for the war," that England "was fully cognizant of this fact," and that the latter's "claim that she entered this war solely as the protector of small nations is a fable."

So far as I know, no such claim has been made by England. The word "solely" is interpolated to make the German case stronger. In fact, in the reply by the English professors and men of science to the learned men of Germany responsible for "The Truth About Germany" (page 251), the former say with emphasis:

"Great Britain, together with France, Russia, Prussia and Austria, had solemnly guaranteed the neutrality of Belgium. In the preservation of this neutrality *our deepest sentiments and our most vital interests are alike involved*. Its violation would not only shatter the independence of Belgium itself; it would undermine the whole basis which renders possible the neutrality of any State and the very existence of such States as are weaker, much weaker, than their neighbors. *We acted in 1914 just as we acted in 1870.*"

But if the claim had been made, it would have had greater inherent probability and would be far more strongly upheld and substantiated by the admitted facts than is this last absurd effort to represent Germany as resisting "with quiet politeness" a demand, "as a price of British neutrality" to consent to her own "humiliation" and "retirement from the position of a Great Power."

Is it likely that a nation—or two nations—obviously, as events have shown, unprepared for immediate war would have made such a demand upon the greatest military power the world has ever seen, at a time when, as events have also shown, she was ready to the last apparently petty detail to challenge, if need be, United Europe? Does not every intelligent person in the world know that her early successes, on the offensive, were due to this very preparedness, which her opponents could at the time but feebly imitate? And since then, in her remarkable defensive campaign, was not her temporary safety assured by these same preparations, so complete last August that it is scarcely conceivable that they could have been bettered by or through delay?

But even in this paper the same clumsy confusion between "Might" and "Right," which has put Germany on the defensive before the civilized world is once more shown. I wish I had space to quote in full that part of this "Review of Official War-Papers." It speaks of the "heavy heart" with which Germany, "following the law of self-preservation," "decided to violate the neutrality of Belgium." It says that after England had informed the Belgians—as by solemn contract and by every law of honor and decency she was bound to do—that she would support them in case "Germany applied pressure to induce them to depart from neutrality"—England's own words—"Belgian fanaticism broke loose against Germany."

Can Americans read with any patience the German expressions of *ex post facto* regret—the hypocritical assumption that they are discharging a sacred duty?

"By nobody," says the *Kölnische Zeitung* (close to the Berlin authorities), "is the fate of Belgium, the burning down of every building, the destruction of Louvain, so deeply deplored as by

the German people and our brave troops, who felt bound to carry out to the bitter end the chastisement they were compelled to inflict."

Every burglar who,—caught red-handed and resisted,—added murder to his other crimes, might with equal force "deeply deplore" the "necessity" that "compelled" him to "inflict chastisement."

It is nauseating.

And through it all outcrops at all sorts of malapropos times their insufferable self-appreciation.

"We, however," says the Berlin *Tageszeitung*, "do not need to regard the public opinion of the world. In the last instance the German people, united with the Emperor, are alone competent to decide the correctness of Germany's course."

The plea of "necessity" constantly recurs in the German *apologiae*, and was symbolized and summarized by Gerhart Hauptmann, the German dramatist, in his reply to an appeal from the Frenchman, Romain Rolland, author of "Jean Christophe":

"Our jealous enemies forged an iron ring around our breast and we knew our breast had to expand, that it had to split asunder this ring, or else we had to cease breathing."

Translated into plain English, dear reader, this is as if your neighbor Schmidt, his family having somewhat outgrown the modest residence in which he began house-keeping, had called God to witness that in the Holy name of Family it was necessary for him to take your house and that of his other neighbor Claretie (and some of your out-lying farms),—and that it was also necessary (under God's guidance) to get at you through the property of a third

neighbor, Vandervelde, which property, as the latter objected and resisted, it was further necessary to burn and destroy together with many of Vandervelde's children and his wife.

In reply to these various German attempts to establish the righteousness of their cause by the plea of necessity for more room, and to their charges that Great Britain, having all she needs, is meanly and falsely trying to shut out the Teutons, Mr. Powys writes: (37)

"How are we to suppose that Anglo-Saxon authorities would answer the charge of hypocrisy and disingenuousness? I fancy they would claim—at any rate we may now be allowed to claim for them—that, quite obviously, the events of the past cannot be changed. By whatever means the Anglo-Saxon got possession of so vast a portion of the world's surface, he *has* got possession of it, and now holds it firmly. His apologists would doubtless add that not only does he hold it firmly, but he holds it wisely and liberally; he holds it, in fact, with as much regard for the liberty and local traditions of the peoples involved as is compatible with holding it at all. But the fact that the events of the past have enabled him to secure all these spoils ought not to be made a reason for the perpetual continuation of the struggle. He has secured them. That is the end of it. If the Germans had been equally favored by opportunity and chance they would have secured them. But as things are now, the past cannot be changed. And evolution must go forward. And such evolution, forcing life up to a different sort of struggle upon a different sort of plane, must be allowed free play for new valuations and new moral standards."

Chesterton has well summed up the German ethics. They have been told by their politicians that all arrangements dissolve before "necessity." That is the importance of the German Chancellor's phrase, excusing and explaining the violation of the neutrality of Belgium: "We are now

in a state of necessity and necessity knows no law." He did not allege some special excuse in the case of Belgium, which might make it an exception to the rule. He distinctly argued, as on a principle applicable to other cases, that victory was a necessity and honor was a scrap of paper.

"The Prussians had made a new discovery," says Chesterton, "in international politics—that it may often be convenient to make a promise and yet curiously inconvenient to keep it. . . . They, therefore, promised England a promise on condition that she broke a promise and on the implied condition that the new promise might be broken as easily as the old one."

This, after all, well summarizes an important part of the German "diplomacy."

To return to Mr. Beck's paper, I beg to say finally that I have quoted some of his conclusions without his arguments, because, while the latter were incapable of satisfactory condensation, within my limits, I wanted to call particular attention to the impression made on the highly trained mind of one representative American by the documents on which the German and German-American special pleaders largely rest their case.

The responsibility for the war seems likely to be a perennial subject of discussion, but every new fact disclosed tends to fix it more and more clearly upon Germany. Recently (38), the former Premier of Italy, Giovanni Giolitti, in a speech to the Italian Parliament, revealed an episode of a year ago last August which had a bearing on the present war. He said that:

"In August, 1913, Austria notified the Italian Government by telegram that she intended to make war on Serbia; and at that time, in response to Austria's inquiry about Italy's attitude, he, as Prime Minister, and the then Minister of Foreign Affairs, the Marquis di San Giuliano, agreed in telling Austria

that, as such a war would be a war of aggression and not of defense, Italy would not be bound by the Triple Alliance to aid Austria, and would therefore remain neutral. 'It is necessary to declare this to Austria in the most formal manner,' said Signor Giolitti to the Foreign Minister at that time, 'hoping that Germany will act to dissuade Austria from a very dangerous adventure.' This interpretation of the Triple Alliance, Signor Giolitti explained to the Italian Parliament, was accepted by Germany and Austria. The statement is not only important as confirming the general opinion expressed before the war that Italy would not aid the other two members of the Triple Alliance in aggressive warfare, but is also significant as evidence of Austria's and Germany's plans that will help to sustain the verdict already reached by neutral peoples concerning the responsibility for this war."

Here again it seems fruitless to continue to adduce evidence—it would be only cumulative. To Americans who care to pursue it further I would recommend two works: Mr. Beck's "The Evidence in the Case" and Dr. Dillon's "A Scrap of Paper, the Inner History of German Diplomacy."

In the former, Mr. Beck has summed up in his usual masterly way the morals of the situation and has drawn an illuminating comparison between what might happen to us and what has happened to Belgium.

"If, however, there had been no Hague Convention and no Treaty of 1839, and if Germany, England and France had never entered into reciprocal obligations in the event of war to respect Belgium's neutrality, nevertheless upon the broadest considerations of international law the invasion without its consent would be without any justification whatever.

"It is a fundamental axiom of international law that each nation is the sole and exclusive judge of the conditions under which it will permit an alien to cross its frontiers. Its territory is *sacro-sanct*. No nation can invade the territory of another without its consent. To do so by compulsion is an act

of war. Each nation's land is its castle of asylum and defense. This fundamental right of Belgium should not be confused or obscured by balancing the subordinate equities between France, Germany and England with respect to their formal treaty obligations.

"Belgium's case has thus been weakened in the forum of public opinion by too insistent reference to the special treaties. The right of Belgium and of its citizens as individuals, to be secure in their possessions rests upon the sure foundation of inalienable right and is guarded by the immutable principle of moral law, 'Thou shalt not steal.' It was well said by Alexander Hamilton:

"The sacred rights of man are not to be searched for in old parchments and musty records; they are written as with a sunbeam in the whole volume of human nature by the hand of Divinity itself and can never be erased by mortal power."

"This truth can be illustrated by an imaginary instance. Let us suppose that the armies of the Kaiser had made the progress which they so confidently anticipated, and had not simply captured Paris, but had also invaded England, and that, in an attempt to crush the British Empire, the German General Staff planned an invasion of Canada. Let us further suppose that Germany thereupon served upon the United States such an arrogant demand as it made upon Belgium, requiring the United States to permit it to land an army in New York, with the accompanying assurance that neither its territory nor independence would be injured, and that Germany would generously reimburse it for any damage.

"Let us further suppose—and it is not a very fanciful supposition—that the United States would reply to the German demand that under no circumstances should a German force be landed in New York or its territory be used as a base of hostile operations against Canada. To carry out the analogy in all its details, let us then suppose that the German fleet should land an army in the city of New York, arrest its Mayor, and check the first attempt of its outraged inhabitants to defend the city by demolishing the Cathedral, the Metropolitan Art Gallery, the City Hall and other structures, and shooting down remorselessly large numbers of citizens, because a few non-combatants had not accepted the invasion with due humility.

"Although Germany had not entered into any treaty to respect the territory of the United States, no one would seriously contend that Germany would be justified in such an invasion."

And in still another American book (39), Mr. Oswald Garrison Villard calls attention to a point which has hitherto escaped most of the controversialists:

"It would also not be amiss for those Germans who ponder over the failure of the neutral nations to sympathize with Germany, to read once more the telegram of the Kaiser to the King of England, of August 1, 1914, in which the Kaiser says: 'The troops on my frontier are in the act of being stopped by telegraph and telephone from *crossing into France*.' The significance of this to American readers lies in the Kaiser's astounding admission that mobilization against France meant immediate invasion of France *before any declaration of war*. Had this fact been publicly known or really understood in Germany, it ought surely to have prevented the repeated assertions that France began the war by sending her aviators over German territory, by the entrance of armed patrols, a sudden attack in Lorraine, etc. For it is evident from the Kaiser's own words that long-prepared orders to invade French soil sent some of his troops onto it the instant the first order to mobilize appeared. Whether those troops did any damage or not, or reached French territory or not, before war was declared, is unimportant. The intent to rush right onto French soil before peace was officially ended is here admitted. It is thoroughly in keeping with the conversation of General von Moltke, in May, 1913, reported by the French ambassador to Berlin, that 'we (the Germans) must begin war *without waiting*, in order brutally to crush all resistance.' This has been denied in Germany, but it is in keeping with the attitude of leading militarists, and was, perhaps, one of the bits of evidence that led Italy to reject outright Germany's claim that Italy must come to her aid because she had been attacked. At any rate, the German propagandists who seek to conquer hostile American opinion must find some way of getting around the Kaiser's despatch. Its revelation of what German mobilization really

meant does, however, in some degree explain why it was that the Kaiser and his military associates were so alarmed by the mere fact of Russian mobilization."

CHAPTER III.

What Has Been the Attitude of the German Apologists in Relation to Belgium Since the Violation of Neutrality?

Professor Weber, of Kiel, said to be "very close to Prince Henry of Prussia and the Hohenzollern family, writes to an American friend:" (40)

"It has been proved with certainty that Belgium had already entered into agreements with France long before the war to permit the passage of hostile troops through Belgium, perhaps even to take the field with them against us.

"By this means Belgium had already surrendered her neutrality and had actually taken a stand with our enemies. That we with one bold blow should dare to take the Belgium fortress is, therefore, easy to understand. We have been far too lenient in that we wished to give back to the Belgians their land unharmed after the fall of Liege.

"Since the Belgians were so deceived as not to accept this magnanimous offer, they must bitterly atone for it."

As usual, nothing worthy of being called "proof" has been adduced in support of this statement, and admiration for the "magnanimity" which led Germany to offer to give back to the Belgians their own land must be withheld.

Dr. Herman Hilprecht says that the Belgian Government "stubbornly declined the German proposition"—to allow the latter to violate the treaty of neutrality—and then attempts to justify fully and without reservation the subsequent over-running of Belgium and the pillage and destruction of Louvain. (41)

Much precisely similar testimony might be adduced,

chiefly from German-American sources, and would amply suffice to show the mistake of the American writer who said: (42).

"The government of Germany has announced that 'the occupation of Belgium is now virtually complete'; and the people of the empire are celebrating the achievement with pride and exultation. Thus is closed one of the bloodiest chapters in the war—and one of the darkest chapters in the records of international dishonor.

"No matter what horrors may await the world in the unfolding of the dreadful conflict, none can exceed in poignant tragedy the fate of this devoted people. From the time of Caesar the bravery and the dauntless independence of the Belgians have been celebrated by historians and sung by poets. And now these high qualities have inspired a supreme demonstration of heroism and sacrifice which makes all humanity the debtor of the martyred nation.

"This is the one phase of the war which can be discussed almost without raising controversy. Upon the issues of Prussian policy, French hatred, British jealousy and Russian plotting, advocates on either side wax furiously eloquent and raise questions which their opponents are taxed to answer.

"But upon the hideous wrong perpetrated upon Belgium, the most ruthless devotee of militarism, the most fanatical exponent of imperialistic destiny and the rights of 'culture,' must take refuge in silence or falter out feeble extenuation. The facts of history, the records of diplomacy and the principles of international justice converge here to denounce an act unparalleled in its cruelty and perfidy."

Unfortunately, since this was written, the imperialistic and "cultured" fanatics have shown that they have no idea of taking refuge in silence, but fatuously believe that they can impose upon a thinking and reasoning world a view that it has already contemptuously and with practical unanimity rejected.

The same writer gives a brief outline of the case (from

a slightly different standpoint from that of Mr. Beck), brings it down to date, and continues:

"This [the treaty of 1839, etc., see pp. 80-82] was the record upon which Belgium stood when the troops of the Kaiser crossed her frontiers on August 2 last. The German government, having already violated the territory of Luxemburg, demanded passage for its forces through the country whose integrity it was sworn to honor and protect. With unblushing effrontery it called this demand a request for 'friendly neutrality,' and declared that in case of opposition Germany would 'consider Belgium as an enemy.'

"There was here a double crime. Germany not only foreswore her own covenant, but undertook to penalize Belgium for observing that country's solemn obligation; for, of course, consent by Belgium to the free passage of the Kaiser's forces would have been a repudiation of the treaty by Belgium and tantamount to an act of war against France.

"Apologists for the invasion have attempted to set up two defences. The first is that France was preparing to violate the treaty, and that Germany simply forestalled her. Fortunately, there are records which utterly disprove this pretense. After Germany's ultimatum, France offered the services of five army corps to Belgium to defend her neutrality. The answer was:

"'We are sincerely grateful to the French government for offering eventual support. In the actual circumstances, however, we do not propose to appeal to the guarantee of the Powers. The Belgian government will decide later on the action which they may think it necessary to take.'

"Belgium preferred to make her first appeal to Germany's sense of honor, and, when that failed, to the heroic resistance of a wronged people. And France was so ill-prepared for the invasion which Germany says she plotted that ten days elapsed before she had her forces in the neutral territory.

"The second excuse offered in *ex post facto* palliation of the offense is that in the Belgian archives Germany has found despatches showing that in 1906 the British military attaché and the Belgian General Staff discussed tentatively plans for landing a British force to defend Belgian neutrality if it were attacked

It shows the desperate nature of the German case when this incident is cited to justify a brutal invasion.

"The arrangement for giving help to Belgium, if needed, was discussed at the time Germany had thrust herself to the verge of war with France over Morocco; and the proposal of Great Britain to defend the neutrality of Belgium, as she was bound to do, was as creditable as Germany's violation of that neutrality was dishonorable.

"All the eloquence and sophistries of the professors, poets, and psychologists advocating the German cause cannot remove the black stain of this deed. The facts are irrefutable, and the proof of guilt inexorable."

Doctor Bernhard Dernburg has made perhaps the most elaborate of the arguments in defense of the violation of Belgium's neutrality. He begins with a series of counter-charges, as follows: England has broken treaties. England has encouraged Portugal to break "a treaty of peace and amity" with Germany. England has "solicited" the severing of the Triple Alliance, *i. e.*, has tried to prevent Italy from fighting by the side of her bitter and hereditary enemy, Austria. Japan broke a Japanese-Chinese treaty. Finally, the United States Supreme Court said in 1889 that, under certain circumstances, treaty stipulations might, in the interest of the country, be disregarded. This judgment was handed down when the Chinese were excluded from the United States.

Much has happened in the quarter of a century since 1889, but there was not then, and is not now, any just basis of comparison between a modification or abrogation of a treaty concerning immigration, and the brutal rape and pillage of a whole country because of its insistence upon the most elementary of human rights.

The fundamental point seems to be this: A treaty between two or more countries *concerning matters of internal administration* may be the subject of change under

changed conditions, or may be abrogated, and such change or abrogation may or may not be considered a *casus belli*. Furthermore, such a treaty may have to be broken in time of war under the law of imperative necessity (now appealed to by the Germans), and the degree of wrong involved in such infraction can be determined only by the circumstances of the particular case.

But a treaty concerning "*neutrality*," in which the interests of five nations are involved, and by which, long in advance of war, each signatory binds itself not to acquire any advantage dependent upon the non-observance of such neutrality *in time of war*, is obviously made with particular reference to war and to war conditions.

The nation that disregards such a treaty, that repudiates for its own interests such an obligation, is, as Mr. Fraley has said (p. 90), like the person who cheats at cards. It should be regarded as outside the pale of civilized intercourse.

Doctor Dernburg's further claim as to Belgium is that the Treaty of 1839, which secured Belgium's independence, was no longer binding, because in 1870 new treaties were negotiated between England and France, and England and the North German Federation (August 9 and 26, 1870), guaranteeing Belgium's neutrality "for the duration of the war and for one year thereafter." Accordingly, he says, the treaty between Belgium and the North German Federation came to an end in May, 1872.

This matter is of vital importance in the argument. If Doctor Dernburg's claim is admitted, it would afford a technical excuse for Germany's treatment of Belgium. I do not believe that in the opinion of this country, or of the world, a dozen such technical excuses would suffice to win for Germany a pardon for her ruthless invasion. But the claim, of course, required examination on its merits. Fur-

thermore, it afforded a test of Doctor Dernburg's veracity, which I was glad to apply. It is, therefore, of twofold significance.

It will be well to repeat here Doctor Dernburg's exact language: (43)

"When the war broke out there was no enforceable treaty in existence to which Germany was a party. Originally, in 1839, a treaty was concluded, providing for such neutrality. In 1866 France demanded of Prussia the right to take possession of Belgium, and the written French offer was made known by Bismarck in July, 1870. Then England demanded and obtained separate treaties with France, and with the North German Federation, to the effect that they should respect Belgium's neutrality, and such treaties were signed on the 9th and 26th of August, 1870, respectively. According to them both countries guaranteed Belgium's neutrality for the duration of the war and for one year thereafter. The war came to an end with the Frankfurt peace in 1871, and the treaty between Belgium and the North German Federation expired in May, 1872."

Before examining into the truthfulness and force of this presentation of the case, it would be well to notice that Doctor Dernburg proceeded in his attempt to sustain it by rewriting for the German Chancellor his speech of August 4, 1914, in which the Chancellor said to the Reichstag that the invasion of Belgium was "contrary to the dictates of international law," and was "wrong." The fatal frankness of these words compelled their dexterous apologist to translate them afresh into modified terms for the benefit of Americans. As softened for our ears, they read thus: "The neutrality of Belgium could not be respected, and we were sincerely sorry that Belgium, a country that, in fact, had nothing to do with the question at issue, and might wish to stay neutral, had to be overrun."

If Doctor Dernburg has the only correct report of this

celebrated and incriminating speech, why has he withheld it until now, in order to confide it tardily to a waiting world?

I asked: What do the words "perpetual neutrality" mean in the Treaty of 1839? When was that treaty abrogated? Surely Doctor Dernburg knows that the negotiation of new treaties does not necessarily mean the abrogation of existing ones. Bismarck himself recognized this fact when, on July 22, 1870, he wrote to the Belgian Minister in Berlin:

"In confirmation of my verbal assurances, I have the honor to give in writing a declaration which, in view of the treaties in force, is quite superfluous, that the Confederation of the North and its Allies will respect the neutrality of Belgium, on the understanding, of course, that it is respected by the other belligerent."

I argued that if no treaty had been in existence since May, 1872 (which is the idea Doctor Dernburg is endeavoring to convey), why did the German Secretary of State say in the Reichstag in 1913, "*The neutrality of Belgium is determined by international conventions, and Germany is resolved to respect these conventions*"?

Why did the German Minister of War say in the same debate: "*Germany will not lose sight of the fact that Belgium's neutrality is guaranteed by international treaties*"?

Why, on July 31, 1914, did the German Minister at Brussels assure "the Belgian Department of State that he knew of a declaration which the German Chancellor had made in 1911 to the effect "that *Germany had no intention of violating our*" (Belgium's) "*neutrality,*" and "that he was certain that the sentiments to which expression was given at that time had not changed"?

Why on August 4, 1914, did the German Foreign Secretary, after wiring the Ambassador in London of a mythical French attack across Belgium, go on to say: "*Germany had consequently to disregard Belgian neutrality*"? How foolish! He should have communicated with Dernburg, and learned that Belgian neutrality died of inanition in May, 1872. What were we to think of Imperial Chancellors and Foreign Secretaries who were unfamiliar with so important a fact, known all the while by an ex-colonial secretary?

But these were theoretical arguments. It seemed worth while to look into the facts. Doctor Dernburg had—incautiously, it seems—supplied the dates.

The *Nouveau Recueil General de Traités* (Vol. XIX, 1874, pp. 591-593) gives the text of the treaties Doctor Dernburg quotes. They were, as he says, signed on August 9, and ratified on August 26, 1870. The expressions used in the treaty between Prussia and Great Britain, and in that between France and Great Britain are identical. Both treaties are "to maintain the independence and the neutrality of Belgium."

In both the penultimate article (Article 3) is the one quoted by Doctor Dernburg. It reads as follows:

"Art. 3. This treaty shall be binding on the High Contracting Parties during the continuance of the present war between North German Confederation and France, and for 12 months after the ratification of any treaty of peace concluded between those parties; and on the expiration of that time the independence and neutrality of Belgium will, so far as the High Contracting Parties are respectively concerned, continue to rest as heretofore on the first article of the Quintuple Treaty of the 19th of April, 1839."

I have italicised the part deliberately omitted by Doctor

Dernburg, a part not even separated from the rest of the article by a period; a part at least as essential and as important to the full significance of the agreement as the part he quoted; but a part which, unfortunately for Doctor Dernburg, absolutely destroyed and nullified his contention that, because of the one-year clause, no treaty obligation in the case of Belgium has existed since 1872. He has left himself no room to deny his purpose because in the very next sentence he says:

"Why the new treaties, if the old one held good? The Imperial Chancellor has been continuously misrepresented as admitting that in the case of Belgium a treaty obligation was broken."

We have already seen that to bolster up this contention—that the Chancellor had been "misrepresented"—he has rewritten the Chancellor's speech. But that he should venture to publish that part of an article of a treaty which, taken from its context, seemed to support his argument, and suppress the portion—the last half of the same paragraph—which absolutely invalidated his argument, was, we confess, a surprise.

Is it possible henceforth to place any reliance upon the statements of a writer who is capable of so glaringly misquoting an official document?

He might as well have rewritten Article III of that treaty to suit the purposes of his argument, just as he does seem to have rewritten the Chancellor's speech, and Germany's message to our State Department (*vide infra*).

Doctor Dernberg has provided for himself a back door of retreat in reply to any such frontal attack, by saying that "when the war broke out, there was no *enforceable* treaty in existence." This is, alas, only too true, but it is about the only scintilla of truth in his whole misleading, sophis-

tical, disingenuous and untrustworthy argument. As its writer elects to call himself a "guest" of this country—on whose invitation he neglects to say—the dictates of hospitality prevent me from applying to his statements a more fitting and more concise term.

Dernburg took occasion at the same time to reiterate the old, old boast as to the glories of German civilization, which the events of the last few months should silence forever on men's tongues. What is civilization? Is it, as Doctor Dernburg seems to think, a matter of technical schools and electrical apparatus? Is it making cheaper stockings than the rest of the world? Assuredly, no! It is primarily a matter of conduct. It is an understanding of honor and of integrity. It is a recognition of the rights of others. The Roman civilization was not a mere matter of good roads, good bridges and good aqueducts, though these things were built well. It did not rest on conquest or on commerce. "What Rome gave and secured," says Mr. Chamberlain, "was a life morally worthy of man." Germany's campaign in Belgium—and the more that is said in defense of this great wrong, the blacker does it appear—is an affront to honor, a deathblow to integrity, a denial of just rights. It is a triumphant exposition of brute force; of a life morally worthy of no man. It is a rejection of civilization, and of all that civilization implies. It is an abrupt return to savage and elemental conditions.

What wonder that, knowing themselves forsworn, the Germans should strive to cast the guilt of their perfidy on Belgium's shoulders! What wonder that, knowing themselves to be unprincipled aggressors, they should have the hardihood to say that Belgium plotted against the peace of Europe! There is no hatred so deep as that which we bear to the man we have wronged. There is no sight so bitter to a nation's eyes as the unstained honor of another

nation it has dishonorably despoiled. As long as history is taught, the tale of Germany's broken word and Belgium's brave resistance will be told the world. As long as men stay men, they will loathe the oppressor and revere the indomitable courage of the oppressed. As long as truth stays truth, the blot on Germany's escutcheon will remain uneffaced and uneffaceable.

Germany's present attitude toward Belgium has, in fact, excited throughout the whole civilized world feelings of the deepest contempt and aversion. The situation has nowhere, in the entire literature of the war, been more clearly and incisively dealt with than in the following editorial from a Philadelphia paper. (44) I quote it entire:

"If Prof. Hugo Münsterberg had not laid aside his avocation as eulogist of Germany's war policy, we should like to put to him a question in psychology. As a loyal German and an expert in the science mentioned, he might be able to explain why German statesmen and writers are so indignant against the Belgians; so rancorously hostile to them; so contemptuous toward their heroism and misery.

"German impatience with France and aversion toward Russia we can understand, and German loathing for Great Britain is an indulgence of which no impartial person would be willing to deprive a nation to which it gives such exquisite satisfaction. The author of the famous 'Hymn of Hate' against England has just received from the Kaiser the decoration of the Red Eagle of the Fourth Class; and everyone will agree that it is a well-deserved honor, selected with discrimination.

"But Belgium was not a powerful rival, like France; nor a 'menace to Teutonic civilization,' like Russia; nor a colossal obstruction to German world empire, like England. She was peaceful, orderly, neutral, innocent of aggressive designs, asking only to be let alone. Even in her anguish she is silent and uncomplaining.

"That the vials of German wrath and contumely should be poured out upon Belgium is rather puzzling, until one recalls the proverbial teaching that it is a human failing to hate most

those whom we have injured. It may be the ruins of Louvain, the rich tribute of war levies and the spectacle of a nation haunted by famine that incite German resentment.

"We have already noted the persistent effort to undermine the world's admiration for Belgium's grave sacrifice. Her consultation with an English military attaché as to possible measures of defense, to be adopted 'only after violation of our neutrality by Germany,' has been denounced as a betrayal, an 'abandonment of neutrality,' by the Belgian government, justly punished by invasion.

"But there is a more personal phase of the controversy which must appeal to many observers. This is the campaign of detraction directed against the Belgians themselves. Recently a German-American publication, the *Fatherland*, criticised the American people for sending relief ships to the starving non-combatants, on the ground that this was assisting the enemies of Germany.

"The instinct of chivalry toward a brave foe seems to be one of the features of war that have disappeared with the march of efficiency. The Belgians are denounced for having resisted invasion; their king, despite his gallantry and devotion, is ridiculed as a deluded conspirator and assailed as the betrayer of his people.

"Sixteen years ago, with three lives between him and inheritance of the crown, Albert, of Belgium, lived for several months in the United States, studying American principles of government and his vocation of engineering. A book which he then wrote disclosed his intense admiration for liberal institutions; and these convictions he carried with him when unexpected deaths raised him to the throne. His simplicity of life, his democratic bearing and his tireless devotion to the economic advancement of Belgium made him a singularly useful and beloved ruler.

"During the war he has shown himself such a king as even democracy may honor. His determination to sacrifice his throne rather than the honor of his country evoked world-wide admiration, for he showed that he did not hesitate to pay his part of the price.

"From the beginning he has shared the dangers of his troops, and to-day is as homeless as the poorest of his subjects. In the defense of Brussels and Antwerp he was daily in the trenches,

and now is in active command of the remnant of his army, which with supreme courage is blocking the path of the Germans to Dunkirk and Calais.

"It is of this leader, whose heroism has been one of the most gallant spectacles of the war, that the *Hanoverscher Anzeiger*, an influential German newspaper, says:

"King Albert, who is now stubbornly defending the last few square miles of his country, will some day give to a future Shakespeare material for a tragedy. It will be the tragedy of a ruler who wanted to make his little nation great and prosperous and happy, and who was shamelessly betrayed by his friends, in whose honesty and fairness he had trusted."

"This reads like a confession of Germany's treaty violation; but it appears that those who 'shamelessly betrayed' Belgium were not the Germans, but the French and English. The paper continues:

"Albert trusted perfidious Albion; he steered his little vessel into the wake of the French ship of state, not knowing that this proud ship was being steered by foreign pilots in foreign pay into a fateful, ruinous undertow."

"And then follows a column of savage sneering in this vein:

"Albert, of the house of Coburg, whose scions are justly famed for their sagacity, did not develop after his kin's tradition. He proved a dilettante on the throne, for did he not lightly sacrifice Belgium's neutrality—the most sacred palladium of all small nations—to vague promises? . . .

"King Albert, unlike his uncle (King Leopold), was always eager to become popular, and could be sure to win the approval and good will of his people by conducting his policies *a la mode de Paris*. More significant of an intimate Belgian leaning toward the western countries, however, was his ambition to make his country a sea power.

"Albert always had been interested in questions of technique, commerce and social economy. It was his intention to continue the colonial policy begun by Leopold II and to develop it, though in a different direction."

"If the war 'had taken a different turn,' says an astute German critic, 'then Belgium would have become a sort of second Portugal, a vassal State, and the great British Empire would have made her feel every day that she owed her existence only to England's mercy.' As it is, of course, she enjoys her present

felicity, and is conscious that she owes it, to Germany's magnanimity.

"It is, however, the democracy of the Belgian king that most exasperates the Teutonic mind:

"He and his people are now suffering the consequences of his ignorance. He made the fatal mistake of considering himself wiser than his uncle was. He played the crowned bourgeois. He catered to the scholars, artists and engineers. He always emphasized his democratic sentiments, which were very popular in Belgium, for that country is much behind in sociological aspect. . . .

"In his ignorance, Albert, the dilettante, lent himself as the tool of the British war-makers and of the French revenge-criers. His Coburger cousin, George of England, has tapped him, and Albert may thank George for the fate into which he stumbled blindly."

"With such sentiments do the leaders of German thought express their conception of international affairs and reveal themselves upon questions of government and morality. The unhappy truth is that Prussianized Germany is utterly incapable of appreciating the Belgian spirit or the Belgian king; of understanding in the remotest degree the soul of this nation she has struck down and the admiration it has stirred throughout the world.

"Despite all her worship of militarism and the cult of glory, Germany could not feel the thrill of these lines by an Australian:

"In that Valhalla where the heroes go,
A careful sentinel paced to and fro
Before the gate, burned black with battle smoke,
Whose echoes to the tread of armed men woke;
Where up the fiery stairs, whose steps are spears,
Came the pale heroes of the blood-stained years.

"There were lean Cæsars from the gory fields,
With heart that only to a sword thrust yields;
And there were generals decked in pride of rank,
Red scabbard swinging from the weary flank;
And slender youths who were the sons of kings,
And barons with their sixteen quarterings.

"And while the nobles went with haughty air,
The courteous sentinel questioned, "Who goes there?"
And as each came, full lustily he cried
His string of titles ere he passed inside.

"And presently there was a little man,
A silent mover in the regal van.
His hand still grasped his rifle, and his eyes
Seemed blinded with the light from Paradise.
His was a humble guise, a modest air—
The sentinel hailed him sharply, "Who goes there?"

"There were no gauds tacked to that simple name,
But every naked blade leaped out like flame,
And every blue-blooded warrior bowed his head—
"I am a Belgian"; this was all he said."

"Germany cries out against her 'ring of enemies.' Which of them does she imagine is the most dangerous? Is it Russia, with her unnumbered hordes; France, with her intrepid armies; England, with her mighty fleet?

"More powerful than any of these is that little nation she has crushed under her weight and now despises and maligns. It is the crime against Belgium that will rob a German triumph of honor or fill a German defeat with bitterness and humiliation. For the judgment of humanity is sure, and it will be as stern as that delivered of old against him who wronged the helpless: 'It were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea.'"

The evidence as to the criminal and altogether indefensible position in which Germany finds herself in regard to Belgium is overwhelming. She has forfeited the respect of the civilized world. Her "promises" and "pledges" and "guarantees" will, as long as the present ruling class is in power, be regarded with contempt or derision by other nations. So far as the Belgian question relates to America, however, I have nowhere seen the issue better expressed than

by Mr. Joseph C. Fraley, of Philadelphia, who, in a brochure entitled "How and Why a War Lord Wages War" (which all Americans should read), says:

"We know that the one hope of stopping wars, is to supply a world-wide sanction for the support of international laws and morals. We have nothing to do with the reasons which led certain powers to engage that Belgian territory should be neutral in time of war. We have everything to do with this particular instance of treaty breaking, in that it constitutes a new departure, a crime against all neutrals. Treaties made for peace conditions are obviously liable to be broken in war, but a treaty made with special reference to war, belongs to that class of obligations whose infringement is like cheating at cards. The offender gets no second chance."

And yet it takes a German-American (Jastrow) to say that the historian of the future will, in analyzing the causes of the war, regard the neutrality of Belgium "as a very minor factor, perhaps entirely negligible"!

Doctor Dernburg says: "England takes the position that, in case France had used Belgium as a stepping stone, England would have gone to war against France for breaking the Belgian neutrality. This is a remarkable proposition." It is remarkable, but only as offering an absolute demonstration, incomprehensible to the German mind, of England's unswerving intention to live up to her treaty obligations.

In August, 1870, as we have seen, on the instance of Lord Granville, Germany and France entered into an identical treaty with Great Britain to the effect that if either belligerent violated Belgian territory, Great Britain would co-operate with the others for the defense of it. This treaty was most strictly construed during the Franco-Prussian war.

It may seem "remarkable" to Doctor Dernburg that a

nation should live up to such an obligation; but whatever our own record may have been, however we may have sinned in the past, we hope that the time will never come when it will seem remarkable to Americans to keep our plighted word.

On July 31, 1914, Sir Edward Grey telegraphed to Sir E. Goschen, British Ambassador at Berlin:

"I said to the German Ambassador this morning that if Germany could get any reasonable proposal put forward which made it clear that Germany and Austria were striving to preserve European peace, and that Russia and France would be unreasonable if they rejected it, I would support it at St. Petersburg and Paris, and go to the length of saying that if Russia and France would not accept it, His Majesty's Government would have nothing more to do with the consequences; but, otherwise, I told the German Ambassador that if France became involved we should be drawn in." (British White Paper, No. 111.)

The following day Grey telegraphed Goschen:

"I told the German Ambassador to-day that the reply of the German Government with regard to the neutrality of Belgium was a matter of very great regret, because the neutrality of Belgium affected feeling in this country. If Germany could see her way to give the same assurance as that which had been given by France, it would materially contribute to relieve anxiety and tension here. On the other hand, if there were a violation of the neutrality of Belgium by one combatant while the other respected it, it would be extremely difficult to restrain public feeling in this country." (British White Paper, No. 123.)

To combat these official and categorical statements, what does Doctor Dernburg offer? "On July 30," he tells us, "the Belgian Chargé d'Affaires at St. Petersburg wrote to

his Government—and the authenticity of this letter cannot be impeached—that the Russian war party got the upper hand upon England's assurance that she would stand in with France." Here is a letter, said to be written by a Belgian Chargé d'Affaires, at St. Petersburg, on July 30. The letter is not given. It does not appear in the official "Diplomatic Correspondence of the War," published by the Belgian Government. Its existence rests on an unsupported statement; but its authenticity "cannot be impeached."

Are the American people, to whom this appeal is addressed, satisfied to accept it as authentic on such evidence? I do not think so.

A little later, after a repetition of what is, as I have already said, the most contemptible and unworthy of all the arguments put forward by German apologists,—the attempt to make Belgium herself responsible for the outrages committed against her (p. 124), a sarcastic effort to say she is "not the 'poor' little country" that is being pictured to the Americans,—Doctor Dernburg proceeds:

"The Imperial Chancellor said that he had proofs that the French were to invade Germany by way of Belgium. Proof there is. French soldiers and French guns, in spite of all the denials made by the French Ambassador at Washington, were in Liège and Namur before the 30th of July. Certainly this proof is only in private letters, but it comes from absolutely unimpeachable people."

What would the Germans and "German-Americans" do without a few phrases, a few stock sentences worn thin in their hard service? Doctor Hilprecht publicly accuses the Allies of frightful cruelties on the basis of "official and absolutely trustworthy other information." Examination

shows that the "official information" is lacking, also the "trustworthiness."

The German Foreign Secretary telegraphs the German Ambassador in London (August 4, 1914) (No. 157, British White Paper): "Please impress upon Sir Edward Grey that the German army could not be exposed to French attack across Belgium, which was planned according to absolutely unimpeachable information,"—information, of course, ungiven.

And now Doctor Dernburg comes along with his unimpeachable authenticity and his "absolutely unimpeachable people."

Doctor Dernburg reiterated his "assurances" that "no matter what happens, the Monroe Doctrine will not be violated by Germany either in North America, or in South America." He had, of course, no authority to give such assurance. He neglected to repeat his former published statement that, by sending Canadian troops to the war, "Canada had placed herself beyond the pale of American protection," a statement confirmed by the inept von Bernstorff, the German Ambassador in this country, who also said that a German invasion of Canada would not violate the Monroe Doctrine. Doctor Dernburg did, however, accuse *Canada* of "a wilful breach of the Monroe Doctrine" by going to war, "thereby exposing the American Continent to a counter-attack from Europe, and risking to disarrange the present equilibrium."

Can casuistry be more finely spun?

Canada, an integral part of the British Empire, sends troops to aid in protecting England from the grave peril threatened by an autocratic military Power; and "thereby" violates a doctrine, the very essence of which was the protection of this entire hemisphere from the possibility of any

such autocratic military Power reaching over the sea to attack our all but defenseless shores.

I must regretfully admit that to a certain sort of "legal" mind this theory of the non-violation of the Monroe Doctrine by the invasion of Canada is technically satisfying (*vide* newspaper reports of a speech of ex-President Taft, November, 1914). But I would ask Americans generally to refuse to accept without grave and justified suspicion any such assurances as those given by von Bernstorff and Dernburg, and also to consider seriously whether they would desire to remain neutral for twenty-four hours after the bombardment of Quebec, or the occupancy of Toronto or Montreal. I think I know the answer. As the *New York World* observed:

"Should German troops ever invade Canada, the application of the Monroe Doctrine to the specific case will be defined in Washington, not in Berlin."

It may be added that unofficial "assurances," however "unimpeachable," were officially modified to "intentions" almost at once by our own State Department, which announced that the instructions of Germany to von Bernstorff were to deny that Germany intends to seek expansion in South America. So the "assurance" becomes an "intent," and the "intent" does not include North America. Doctor Dernburg, more garrulous than his Government, endeavors to soothe our justifiable apprehension. "I am in the position to state," he says blandly, "that immediately after the outbreak of the war, by one of the first mails that reached the United States, the German Government, sent of its own free initiative, a solemn declaration to the Department of State that, whatever happened, she would fully respect the Monroe Doctrine." This would be more reassuring, first,

if Germany *had* so declared, and, next, if Germany's word were at par. But what difference does it make to us whether she swears allegiance to the Monroe Doctrine, or threatens its annihilation? We are no safer, and no more endangered, in the one case than in the other.

But when Doctor Dernburg permits himself to say that "we"—meaning we Germans—"have no ambitions of enlargement in Europe or in America"; when he adds with touching simplicity: "We do not believe in incorporating in our empire any parts of nations that are not of our own language and race," Americans may be pardoned for asking how he reconciles this admirable disinterestedness with the words of the Kaiser addressed to his troops in East Prussia, which began, "Thanks to the valor of my heroes, France has been severely punished. *Belgium, which interfered with our attack, has been added to the glorious provinces of Germany.*"

Dernburg and the Kaiser ought to keep in closer touch if they want to influence America. The Kaiser's order appeared in our press on November 13, 1914. And yet on August 4, 1914, the German Foreign Secretary telegraphed the German Ambassador in London:

"Please dispel any mistrust that may subsist on the part of the British Government with regard to our intentions, by repeating most positively formal assurance that even in the case of armed conflict with Belgium, Germany will, under no pretense whatever, annex Belgian territory. Sincerity of this declaration is borne out by the fact that we solemnly pledged our word to Holland strictly to respect her neutrality. It is obvious that we could not profitably annex Belgian territory without making at the same time territorial acquisitions at expense of Holland. (British White Paper, No. 157.)"

We wonder if the attention of Holland has been called

to the Kaiser's order, as read in conjunction with the Secretary's admirable telegram! When it is, they should be read together with the opinion of the Kaiser's Professor of Philosophy at Berlin, Dr. Lasson: (45)

"We Germans have little esteem and less respect and sympathy for the Holland of the present day. Holland in its isolation sinks more and more into the dull narrow-mindedness that is the mark of small sects. Without its hold on Germany it would have long ago disappeared. God be praised that the Dutch are not our friends."

More recently (January, 1915), von Bethmann-Hollweg has felt it necessary to go back to the "scrap of paper" interview of August 4th, and re-interpret it, chiefly for the benefit of Americans. I have dealt with this elsewhere (p. 300), but it seems worth while to record the impression this effort has made upon an American editor: (46)

"More important, but no more candid, is the recent defense put forth by the Imperial Chancellor, Doctor von Bethmann-Hollweg. This statesman's courageous admission at the opening of the war that Germany was committing 'a great wrong' because of 'necessity' has been the one noble utterance of his Government during the conflict. He now rejects, however, the esteem which his frank and generous statement won and joins the chorus of detraction against Belgium.

"As the originator of the 'scrap of paper' doctrine regarding treaties, the Chancellor had attained a world-wide eminence which he resents. After six months' cogitation, he has decided that he has been a victim of misunderstanding, and that his historic phrase, far from being a cynical repudiation of international honor, was, in reality, an indictment of British hypocrisy and Belgian perfidy. He repeats the charge that Belgium had 'abandoned her neutrality' by consulting with Britain as to resisting the long-threatened violation by Germany, and says:

"England drew the sword only because she believed her own interests demanded it. Just for Belgian neutrality she would never have entered the war. That is what I meant when I told Sir Edward Goschen that among the reasons which had impelled England to go into the war, the Belgian neutrality treaty had for her only the value of 'a scrap of paper.'"

"We do not know the nature of the doctoral degree which the Chancellor holds, but in view of his defense we sincerely hope it is not a doctorate of laws. His attempt to erase the 'scrap of paper' stigma from the Government which assassinated Belgian nationality and stamp it upon the country which went to war in defense of that cause challenges admiration for its audacity rather than its wisdom.

"We by no means subscribe to the theory that Great Britain's foreign policy is purely altruistic, or that she is pouring out her blood and treasure solely for the sake of plundered Belgium. Nor is this fantastic idea suggested by Britain herself. If Belgium had lain several hundred miles distant instead of across a narrow channel, and if a Germanized Belgium had not meant, as Germany boasted, 'a knife at the throat of England,' the British Government and people would possibly not have construed their guarantee of Belgium's neutrality to require resort to arms.

"But even in that case it would have been Germany, not England, that made the treaty 'a scrap of paper,' while, as the matter stands, Great Britain is incontestably in the position of upholding her part in the treaty at tremendous cost, while Germany as clearly has violated her part for her own advantage.

"The fundamental inspiration of England, of course, is self-interest or self-preservation—the identical purpose which Germany pleads. But it cannot be denied that she is promoting that cause by defending a cruelly wronged nation and the sanctity of international obligations, while Germany, under the same plea, has forsworn her word and committed a monstrous assault.

"It is really astonishing that a statesman of high attainments should offer such a defense as that of Doctor von Bethmann-Hollweg. If it was an act of necessity, even of virtue, for Germany to violate the treaty for self-protection, it is quite out of the question for impartial observers to find guilty the country which observed and defended the treaty for the same reason.

“‘England ought really to cease harping on this theme of Belgian neutrality,’ says the exasperated Chancellor. He does not yet realize that that chord vibrates to the finger of humanity and that the note of its condemnation will resound through all time.”

CHAPTER IV.

As Time Went on, Has There Been Reason to Modify or to Mitigate the Almost Universal Condemnation of Germany's Treatment of Belgium, Felt and Expressed at the Outset in This Country?

I purposely abstain from making in this connection any definite accusation as to the individual "atrocities" ascribed to the Germans by the French and Belgians, because the evidence, even when it has been taken under oath, with names, places, dates, and details (as is the case with that offered to the world by the Belgian Commission), is met by denials, also under oath, and by virulent countercharges. It is also met, most ineffectively and almost absurdly, by the repeated publication of statements by some American newspaper correspondents who, I am sure with entire truthfulness, declare that, having been in the countries of the combatants, they saw no cases of such atrocities and could obtain no convincing evidence that they ever took place. This is interesting but unimportant. If the fact that certain persons, even those living continuously at or near the scene of a crime, and not merely visiting it with the escort and protection of the suspected criminals, had not seen the crime committed, and could get no reliable evidence that it had been committed, were allowed to weigh in Courts of Justice against the testimony of eye-witnesses who *had* seen it, there would be a general and world-wide jail delivery.

Six reputable witnesses of a murder, a rape, a burglary, or an arson (and the Belgium case has the ear-marks of all

four) should outweigh six million who would swear that—not having been there—they did not see it, and that they were later unable to obtain evidence satisfactory to themselves that the murder, rape, burglary, or arson, had occurred. The entire question is one of the credibility of certain witnesses and of the weight to be given to collateral circumstances that have a bearing upon the case. Taking the latter first, should not the following extracts from German official orders be regarded as having a direct relation to the matter?

EXTRACT FROM A PROCLAMATION TO THE MUNICIPAL
AUTHORITIES OF THE CITY OF LIEGE.

“August 22d, 1914.

“The inhabitants of the town of Andenne, after having declared their peaceful intentions, have made a surprise attack on our troops.

“It is with my consent that the Commander-in-Chief has ordered the whole town to be burned and that about one hundred people have been shot.

“I bring this fact to the knowledge of the city of Liège, so that citizens of Liège may realize the fate with which they are menaced if they adopt a similar attitude.

“The General Commanding in Chief.

“(Signed) VON BULOW.”

NOTICE POSTED AT NAMUR, AUGUST THE 25TH, 1914.

(1) “French and Belgian soldiers must be surrendered as prisoners of war at the prison before 4 o'clock. *Citizens who do not obey will be condemned to enforced labor for life in Germany.*

“*A rigorous inspection of houses will begin at 4 o'clock. Every soldier found will be immediately shot.*

(2) “Arms, powder, dynamite, must be surrendered at 4 o'clock. Penalty: death by shooting.

“The citizens who know where a store of arms is located must

inform the Burgomaster, *under penalty of enforced labor for life.*

(3) "Each street will be occupied by a German guard, who will take ten hostages in each street, whom they will keep in custody.

"If any outrage is committed in the street, *the ten hostages will be shot.*

"The Commandant of the City.

"(Signed) VON BULOW."

Namur, 25th August, 1914.

(Imprimerie Chantaine.)

LETTER ADDRESSED ON AUGUST 27TH, 1914, BY LIEUTENANT-GENERAL VON NIEBER TO THE
BURGOMASTR OF WAVRE.

"On August 22d, 1914, the General Commanding the 2d Army, Herr von Bulow, imposed upon the city of Wavre a war levy of three million francs, to be paid before September 1st, as expiation for its unqualified behavior (contrary to the Law of Nations and the usages of war) in making a surprise attack on the German troops. . . .

"I draw the attention of the City to the fact that in no case can it count on further delay, as the civil population of the City has put itself outside the Law of Nations by firing on the German soldiers.

"*The City of Wavre will be burned and destroyed if the levy is not paid in due time, without regard for anyone; the innocent will suffer with the guilty.*"

PROCLAMATION POSTED AT GRIVEGNEE, SEPTEMBER
8TH, 1914.

"(1) Before the 6th of September, 1914, at 4 o'clock in the afternoon, all arms, munitions, explosives and fireworks which are still in the hands of the citizens, must be surrendered at the Chateau des Bruyeres. *Those who do not obey will render themselves liable to the death penalty. They will be shot on the spot, or given military execution, unless they can prove their innocence.* . . .

"(5) In order to be sure that this permission is not abused, the Burgomasters of Beyne-Heusay and of Grivegneee shall immediately draw up a list of persons who shall be held as hostages,* at the fort of Fleron, in 24-hour shifts; on September 6th, for the first time, from 6 o'clock in the evening until mid-day, September 7th.

**"The life of these hostages will depend upon the population of the aforesaid communes remaining pacific under all circumstances.*

"(6) I will designate from the lists submitted to me the persons who will be detained as hostages from noon of one day to noon of the next day. If the substitute does not arrive in time, the hostage will remain another 24 hours. *After this second period of 24 hours, the hostage incurs the penalty of death if the substitution is not made.*

"(10) *Anyone knowing of the location of a store of more than one hundred litres of petroleum, benzine, benzol, or other similar liquids in the aforesaid communes, and who does not report same to the military commander on the spot, incurs the penalty of death, provided there is no doubt about the quantity and the location of the store. Quantities of 100 litres are alone referred to.*

"(11) Anyone who does not instantly obey the command of 'hands up,' becomes guilty (sic) of the death-penalty. . . .

NOTICE POSTED AT BRUSSELS, OCTOBER 5TH, 1914, AND
PRESUMABLY IN MOST OF THE COMMUNES
IN THE COUNTRY.

"On the evening of September 25th, the railway and telegraph lines were destroyed on the Lovenjoul-Vertryck line.

"Consequently, the two above-mentioned places, on the morning of September 30th, had to give an account and to furnish hostages.

"In the future, the communities in the vicinity of a place where such things happen (*no matter whether or not they are accomplices*) will be punished without mercy.

"To this end, hostages have been taken from all places in the vicinity of railroad lines menaced by such attacks, and at

the first attempt to destroy the railroad tracks or the telegraph or telephone wires, they will be immediately shot.

"Furthermore, all troops in charge of the protection of the railroad lines have received orders to shoot any person approaching, in a suspicious manner, the railroad tracks or the telegraph or telephone lines.

"The Governor General of Belgium,
"(Signed) **BABON VON DER GOLTZ,**
"*Field Marshal.*"

NOTICE POSTED AT BRUSSELS, NOVEMBER 1ST, 1914.

"A legally constituted Court Martial has pronounced, the 28th of October, 1914, the following condemnations:

"(1) Upon Policeman De Ryckere for attacking, in the exercise of his legal functions, an agent vested with German authority, for wilfully inflicting bodily injury on two occasions, in concert with other persons, for facilitating the escape of a prisoner, on one occasion, and for attacking a German soldier—*Five years imprisonment.*

"The city of Brussels, excluding suburbs, has been punished, for the crime committed by its policeman, De Ryckere, against a German soldier by an additional fine of *five million francs.*

"The Governor of Brussels,
"(Signed) **BARON VON LUTWITZ,**
"*General.*"

EXTRACT FROM THE SIXTH REPORT OF THE BELGIAN
COMMISSION OF INQUIRY.

"After such proclamations, who will be surprised at the murders, burnings, pillage and destruction committed by the German army wherever they have met with resistance?

"If a German corps, or patrolling party, is received at the entrance to a village by a volley from soldiers of the regular troops who are afterwards forced to retire, the whole population is held responsible. The civilians are accused of having fired or having co-operated in the defense, and without inquiry, the

place is given over to pillage and flames, a part of the inhabitants are massacred. . . .

"The odious acts which have been committed in all parts of the country have a general character, throwing the responsibility upon the whole German army. It is simply the application of a preconceived system, the carrying out of instructions, which have made of the enemy's troops in Belgium 'a horde of barbarians and a band of incendiaries.'"

A very extraordinary instance of German prevision has been brought to light by Prof. Raymond Weeks. (47) It is to be read in conjunction with the military orders quoted above and with the American and German evidence as to atrocities given below. It constitutes, perhaps, the most unique of all possible additions to the "Complete Letter Writer." Professor Weeks says:

"The German military authorities are said to have foreseen everything. They even foresaw the need of denying atrocities, as is evinced by a manual called *The Military Interpreter*, second edition, Berlin, 1906; publisher, A. Bath. The author is Captain von Scharfenort, an official of the Military Department. This manual, among many useful formulæ, offers a model letter of protest against an accusation of atrocities. This suggestive document is entitled, 'Letter to the Commander-in-Chief of the Hostile Army,' and commences thus:

"In a circular letter of the Minister of Foreign Affairs you have reproached the German troops with numerous violations of international custom.

"According to you, German troops have been guilty of acts of hostility against ambulances; they are said to have made prisoner, M. A., in the midst of an ambulance corps organized by him; they are accused of having made use of explosive bullets, of having compelled peasants in the vicinity of S. to dig trenches under fire; they are accused of having attempted to transport provision and munition trains and caissons by protecting them with the conventional sign of Geneva; finally, a physician who was caring for a wounded Prussian soldier is said to have been killed by him.

"Although I was quite sure, *a priori*, that these accusations were false, I was unwilling to rest content with simply assuring you that such things were impossible, and I made an inquiry to discover whether something might have happened which could have been transformed, by reporters unworthy of credence or filled with malevolence, into the monstrosities which were laid at our door.'

"After stating that the inquiry offered great difficulties because of the vagueness of the accusations, he continues:

"It is exact that M. A. was arrested, and that he had been occupied in caring for the wounded, but his arrest did not take place in the midst of an ambulance corps. It was motivated by the suspicion that the above-mentioned person was in communication with the garrison of S., and his arrest, as also his imprisonment which followed, took place with all of the consideration due to his situation and to his honorability. As to the duration of his detention, the military investigation alone can decide. As for all the other affirmations, I must declare them to be fabrications. Out of regard for the Powers which adhered to the Convention of Geneva and the declaration of St. Petersburg of November 29 (11 December), 1868, I add here and I affirm that the said-mentioned convention has been observed by the German troops in the most scrupulous manner,' etc.

"Yes,' Professor Weeks adds, 'the German military authorities foresaw everything—except that some of their soldiers' diaries would be captured.'"

The strongest *à priori* argument against belief in German atrocities rests upon the inherent improbability that men such as the Germans we have all known, and most of whom we have liked, could be so transformed by war as to be guilty of even a tithe of the hideous and bestial outrages said to have been perpetrated by them.

But *are* they the Germans we have known? Is it safe to argue from Philip sober to Philip drunk? It is said that they were under iron discipline. Perhaps they were; but if that discipline openly and brazenly included a policy of

terrorism of the civilian populations of conquered territory, it is itself an argument for the plaintiffs. A system that could in time of peace condone the Zabern infamy, as between individuals, could conceivably in time of war condone the asserted Belgian atrocities, as between nations. Military mouthpieces say (unrebuked, so far as I know), that "any act" committed by their troops for the purpose of "discouraging, defeating and destroying the enemy is a brave act." General von Disfurth is said to have said: (p. 42) "I hope that in this war we have merited the title barbarians."

As to the asserted physical impossibility that some of the alleged occurrences could have taken place, I may speak with more confidence, from expert knowledge. The accomplished lady who writes for an American paper under the *nom-de-plume* of "Sallie Wistar" asked my opinion of the statement of a correspondent, who said: (48)

"It is unworthy of our people to accept such tales without proof. A moment's thought ought to convince any intelligent mind that a child, whose hands had been hacked off by the sword, could not have survived such an experience, unless, indeed, the most skilled surgical treatment were immediately administered on the spot. . . . It would require overwhelming proof to convince reasonable minds that any hapless, innocent Belgian child ever had its hands lopped off by the kindly Germans."

I replied: "Your correspondent is mistaken in supposing that no child whose hands had been cut off could survive hemorrhage, fever, and shock unless skilled surgical aid be at once administered. The records of every accident and emergency hospital in the world would contradict this.

"The proportion of children who would die after such mutilation would vary with the amount of hemorrhage, the degree of fever, or the extent of shock.

"But accepting the current descriptions as approximately correct, hemorrhage might be trifling, as it is apt to be after blunt wounds and crushes; fever would be absent if the wound remained, as it might remain, uninfected, and shock would be present to greater or less degree in accord with the elements of bleeding, pain and fright. Shock might be relatively trifling and need not in any case be necessarily fatal.

"In some of the reported cases it seemed evident that the removal of the hand or hands had been a sequel to the wounds received, and, as might be expected, not an immediate and instantaneous severance by a sweep of a sabre. The latter would require a degree of expertness scarcely to be expected even from one of the War Lord's 'heroes.'

"To sum up, nothing that I have seen as to the alleged German atrocities is surgically impossible of belief."

Perhaps the most astounding position taken by German-Americans as to Germany's behavior toward Belgium is to be found in an article called "War Hypocrisy Unveiled" in which the author (Albert E. Henschel), a member of the New York Bar (49), in reply to the suggestion that Germany might invade this country to attack Canada, says:

"In place of this most unfair analogy let us suppose that your house was afire, with the only means of escape over your neighbor's roof. Would you dally over the question of the 'neutrality' of your neighbor's house—considering that his home is his castle?—or would you simply go over his roof and save yourself and your family?

"But what did the Germans do? Did they rush helter skelter into Belgium without so much as saying, 'By your leave'?"

"No. To the honor and dignity of human nature be it said that in that time of imminent peril they did what no other nation has ever done, they delayed sufficiently—when every moment was precious—to ask permission of Belgium and to give

assurance that her integrity and independence would be protected and reparation made for all losses. The future historian will refer to this act of Germany as a manifestation of a most sublime sense of justice, original and unique in the annals of the world.

"When this offer was refused Germany did what any other European nation would have done in the first place. She went into Belgium to save herself from destruction.

"There is no doubt that Belgium had the right to refuse permission and to resist invasion. But, when she made her choice, which involved war with Germany, she cannot complain of the war thus invited."

There is one point as to which many Americans will agree with him. Germany's act considered as "a manifestation of a most sublime sense of justice" is, beyond all cavil, "original and unique in the annals of the world."

I wish every American who desires to reach a just conclusion as to the question of "atrocities" could find time and opportunity to read "German Atrocities in France," a translation of the official report of the French Commission the reports of the Belgian Commission of Inquiry (quoted above); "The Innocence of Belgium, established by the Military Documents Published by Germany"; and "Les Crimes Allemands, d'après les Témoignages Allemands," by Joseph Bédier, Professor at the Collège de France. He would then be in possession of the affirmative side of the question and could judge for himself what weight to give to the denials.

There is some evidence, however, which a book prepared by an American, for Americans, should contain. It has been summarized by Dr. Morton Prince in articles that appeared in February (50), and have been reprinted with the caption "The American *Versus* the German Viewpoint of the War." Dr. Prince reviews a series of articles by

Dr. von Mach, in which, under the heading, "The German Viewpoint," he gives pictures of German army life in order to show that a prophecy of the elder Moltke's has been fulfilled and that because universal service has brought "the educated classes" into the army "a more humane way of waging war" has resulted. Dr. von Mach quotes from an account written by Professor von Hartmann, now serving as a lieutenant in the German army. He calls his first "picture," a "French Lesson at the Front. Place—A Stubble Field in Belgium. Time—Autumn, 1914." He depicts groups of the "splendid fellows from the country" who have lighted their pipes after breakfast and are "singing the beautiful home and soldier songs," which "often soften, for the time being, even the hardest hearts of warriors." Then they have a lesson in French! Another "picture" shows them marching to the front, singing Koerner's "Prayer During Battle," beginning "Father I Call to Thee." Dr. von Mach adds: "Whatever selfish train of thought the individual soldier or officer had been following fell into insignificance before the grand conception of God and man."

Dr. Prince then presents *his* pictures, from the American viewpoint. He says:

"Dr. von Mach has given his pictures as drawn by an eye witness, Professor Hartmann, a German. Let me, too, draw some pictures, and let me, too, take my pictures from an eye witness in Belgium; but he shall be a neutral witness, an American, Mr. E. Alexander Powell, who had unusual opportunities to observe what he describes in his book, recently published, 'Fighting in Flanders.' He was one of the few correspondents on the firing line. . . .

"I cite this account because I wish to disregard all *ex parte* testimony. All the Belgian accounts are those of interested witnesses. We shall see the war waged in Belgium not from

the Belgian or the German viewpoint, but from the American viewpoint."

He calls his picture "A German Lesson at the Front." Place—Aerschot. Time—August, 1914." He says that to understand the picture we must remember that orders had been deliberately given to burn and pillage Aerschot by the German commander after the German troops had entered the town. This, the commander himself told Mr. Powell, was in retaliation for the shooting of the chief of staff by a boy, 15 years of age, the son of the burgomaster. "What followed," Mr. Powell was given to understand—the execution of the burgomaster, his son and several score of the leading townsmen, the giving over of the women to a lust-mad soldiery, the sacking of the houses, and the final burning of the town—"was the punishment which would always be meted out to towns whose inhabitants attacked German soldiers."

This is what Mr. Powell saw:

"In many parts of the world I have seen many terrible and revolting things, but nothing so ghastly, so horrifying as Aerschot. Quite two-thirds of the houses had been burned, and showed unmistakable signs of having been sacked by a mad-dened soldiery before they were burned.

"Everywhere were the ghastly evidences. Doors had been smashed in with rifle-butts and boot heels; windows had been broken; pictures had been torn from the walls; mattresses had been ripped open with bayonets in search of valuables; drawers had been emptied upon the floors; the outer walls of the houses were spattered with blood and pock-marked with bullets; the sidewalks were slippery with broken bottles; the streets were strewn with women's clothing.

"It needed no one to tell us the details of that orgy of blood and lust. The story was so plainly written that anyone could read it." . . .

"Piecing together the stories told by those who did survive

that night of horror, we know that scores of townspeople were shot down in cold blood, and that, when the firing squads could not do the work of slaughter fast enough, the victims were lined up and a machine gun was turned upon them.

"We know that young girls were dragged from their homes and stripped naked and violated by soldiers—many soldiers—in the public square in the presence of officers.

"We know that both men and women were unspeakably mutilated, that children were bayoneted, that dwellings were ransacked and looted, and that finally, as though to destroy the evidences of their horrid work, soldiers went from house to house with torches, methodically setting fire to them."

It may be observed here that there seems good reason to believe that, in many instances, the houses which were spared by the German soldiery, in accordance with directions chalked upon their doors or shutters—"güte Leute-Nicht zu plündern"—were those occupied by the German spies, known as "fixed agents." Germany is thought to spend \$3,900,000 a year on this branch of her spy system; and at the outbreak of the present war the number of "fixed" spies, *i. e.*, spies permanently residing in a country, were in France alone over 15,000. (51)

The reason given by the Germans for the outrages at Aerschot—that the 15-year-old son of the burgomaster shot a German officer—is not denied. The Germans say that it was part of a pre-arranged plan. The Belgians say that the boy was acting in defence of his sister's honor. No one now knows *certainly* which story was true.

But, as Dr. Prince says:

"There must have been some reason, or perhaps the boy was a fanatic, or half-witted. Surely no sane man, and surely no man holding the responsible position of burgomaster, would give a dinner party to German officers and arrange to have his own son shoot one of them, knowing that there was no escape

from the consequences of such an act committed in his own home.

"But accept either story you like, what do you think of the commanding officer, of the mode of conducting war, that executes several score of the leading townsmen, that shoots down women and children, that gives over the women to the soldiery, that orders the sacking of the houses and, finally, the burning down of the town, house by house, because a boy shot an officer?"

"Is this the German idea of a 'humane way of waging war'?"

"If you think this mode quite justified, let me tell you how it impressed an American, one, remember, accustomed to the sights of war in many lands:

"It was with a feeling of repulsion amounting almost to nausea that we left what had once been Aerschot behind us."

The second scene, from the American viewpoint, is staged at Louvain. Time—same.

Mr. Powell says it was: "Another scene of destruction and desolation." He describes the charred skeletons of the handsome buildings and says: "The fronts of many of the houses were smeared with crimson stains." He continues:

"In comparison to its size, the Germans had wrought more widespread destruction in Louvain than did the earthquake and fire combined in San Francisco.

"The looting had evidently been unrestrained. The roads for miles in either direction were littered with furniture and bedding and clothing. Such articles as the soldiers could not carry away they wantonly destroyed. Hangings had been torn down, pictures on the walls had been smashed, the contents of drawers and trunks had been emptied into the streets, literally everything breakable had been broken. This is not from hearsay, remember, *I saw it with my own eyes*. And the amazing feature of it all was that among the Germans there seemed to be no feeling of regret, no sense of shame. Officers in immaculate uniforms strolled about among the ruins, chatting and laughing and smoking."

The orgy of blood and destruction had lasted two days.

"Several American correspondents, among them Mr. Richard Harding Davis, who were being taken by train from Brussels to Germany, and who were held for some hours in the station at Louvain during the first night's massacre, have vividly described the horrors which they witnessed from their car window. On the second day, Mr. Hugh S. Gibson, secretary of the American Legation in Brussels, accompanied by the Swedish and Mexican chargés, drove over to Louvain in a taxicab. Mr. Gibson told me that the Germans had dragged chairs and a dining-table from a nearby house into the middle of the square in front of the station and that some officers, already considerably the worse for drink, insisted that three diplomatists join them in a bottle of wine. And this while the city was burning and rifles were cracking, and the dead bodies of men and women lay sprawled in the streets!"

Dr. Prince adds, addressing Dr. von Mach:

"Indeed, their 'beautiful home and soldier songs,' as you say, had softened their hearts, but the scene is a different one, isn't it?

"But we have the same happy soldiers, 'lounging, talking and laughing,' just as your professor describes them, and smoking and drinking (though it is beer and wine instead of coffee) and 'everybody is elated,' just as you say.

"But the Belgian townspeople, what of them? Do the happy soldiers see them? I don't know."

Louvain was not destroyed by bombardment or in the heat of battle. The Germans had entered it unopposed and had been in undisputed possession for several days.

Mr. Powell had an interview with the commanding general, von Boehn, which as Dr. Prince says, is destined to become classic:

"It had been sought by the general, who had expressed a wish to have an opportunity to talk with Mr. Powell, to give

him the German version of the treatment of the Belgian civil population for the enlightenment of the American public. Mr. Powell was accordingly invited to dine with the general. Here is more of the conversation as given by the former as 'nearly *verbatim*' as he could remember it.

"'But why wreak your vengeance on women and children?' I asked.

"'None have been killed,' the general asserted positively.

"'I am sorry to contradict you, General,' I asserted, with equal positiveness, 'but I have myself seen their bodies. So has Mr. Gibson, the secretary of the American legation in Brussels, who was present during the destruction of Louvain.'

"'Of course,' replied General von Boehn, 'there is always danger of women and children being killed during street fighting if they insist on coming into the streets. It is unfortunate, but it is war!'

"'But how about a woman's body I saw with the hands and feet cut off? How about the white-haired man and his son whom I helped to bury outside of Sempst who had been killed merely because a retreating Belgian soldier had shot a German soldier outside their house?

"'There were 22 bayonet wounds in the old man's face. I counted them. How about the little girl, two years old, who was shot while in her mother's arms by an Uhlan and whose funeral I attended at Heyst-op-den-Berg? How about the old man near Vilvorde who was hung by his hands from the rafters of his house and roasted to death by a bonfire being built under him?'

"'The general seemed taken aback by the exactness of my information.'

I have not space to quote further from Dr. Prince, but I hope all Americans who may read this will remember that the evidence given above is that of Americans, of "neutrals," not of French, or Belgians, or British, or Russians. I would ask them to read also the description of his own mental attitude given by Mr. Powell: (52)

"An American, I went to Belgium at the beginning of the

war with an open mind. I had few, if any, prejudices. I knew the English, the French, the Belgians, the Germans equally well. I had friends in all four countries and many happy recollections of days I had spent in each. When I left Antwerp, after the German occupation, I was as pro-Belgian as though I had been born under the red-black-and-yellow banner. I had seen a country, one of the loveliest and most peaceable in Europe, invaded by a ruthless and brutal soldiery; I had seen its towns and cities blackened by fire and broken by shell; I had seen its churches and its historic monuments destroyed; I had seen its highways crowded with hunted, homeless fugitives; I had seen its fertile fields strewn with the corpses of what had once been the manhood of the nation; I had seen its women left husbandless and its children fatherless; I had seen what was once a Garden of the Lord turned into a land of desolation; and I had seen its people—a people whom I, like the rest of the world, had always thought of as pleasure-loving, inefficient, easygoing—I had seen this people, I say, aroused, resourceful, unafraid, and fighting, fighting, fighting. Do you wonder that they captured my imagination, that they won my admiration? I *am* pro-Belgian; I admit it frankly. I should be ashamed to be anything else.”

I believe that, in the light of the testimony given by a writer, who, having originally been as nearly impartial as one may be to-day, and by the other fair-minded Americans also quoted, the vast majority of my fellow-countrymen will agree with Dr. Prince when he thus apostrophizes some of the more conspicuous German apologists:

“No, Dr. von Mach, you and your fellow propagandists, Dr. Dernburg and Dr. Münsterberg, Dr. Albert and others, appeal in vain to the American people. You do not know the true full-blooded American of the twentieth century. Americans are governed by feelings of humanity, of pity, of mercy, of fair play.

“Those are the ideals of our national conscience. Americans believe in a government for the people and by the people, not in a government by an autocratic military caste, without pity, without mercy, without regard for the rights of mankind.

"If I read the signs of public opinion aright, if I correctly understand American ideals of human rights, Germany stands condemned by American opinion. America cares nothing for the 'necessities of war,' whether argued as an excuse for crimes against humanity by a German General Staff in 1914, or a 'Spanish Butcher' in Cuba in 1898; she cares nothing for fine-spun specious arguments as to why Germany was not to blame for the invasion of Belgium. She sees only a peaceful, unoffending nation defending her inalienable rights to her own soil. And she sees the inhabitants, for this offense, shot down, and their houses, one by one, put to the torch; she sees tens of thousands of homes desolate, and hundreds of thousands of inhabitants driven into exile, or starving and dependent upon American charity—all this, mind you, not as a sporadic instance in one city, but repeatedly, day by day, in many cities and towns; and not as unavoidable accidents from the shelling of the enemy in battle, but deliberately and systematically and unnecessarily, after the capture and occupation of the city, for the sole purpose of revenge, to overcome resistance by terrorism, as officially proclaimed and officially justified. It is for these reasons, if for no others, that Germany appeals in vain to American sympathy."

I have thus far cited only Americans, no Allies. But it may be permitted to offer evidence supplied by the Germans themselves. In addition to the general orders above quoted (p. 100 *et seq.*), which are almost sufficiently damning, we have many involuntary individual confessions in the shape of diaries found on German prisoners. There are large numbers of these and the Marquis de Dampierre is preparing a minute and exhaustive report upon them. In the meanwhile Prof. Joseph Bédier, of the Collège de France, has published a pamphlet which contains a selection from those which first came to hand, with, in each instance, a photographic reproduction of the leaf or leaves quoted from. Nothing could be more direct and definite than this testimony. It is impossible to imagine it to have

been forged or in any way tampered with. The extracts, which are quoted below, are in every case those of which the original German is photographically reproduced. (53)

I translate a few only.

Paul Spielmann (of Company I, Reserve Battalion, Infantry Brigade) describes a night surprise at a village near Blamont. He says:

"The inhabitants have fled by way of the village. It was horrible. Blood is glued against all the houses; and as to the faces of the dead, they were hideous. They were buried at once, to the number of sixty; among them many old women, some old men, and a pregnant woman, all frightful to see; *and three children who were cuddled up one against the other but were all dead.* The altar and the arches of the church were demolished.

"*These people had telephoned to the enemy!* And this morning, September 2d, the survivors have been expelled; and I saw four little boys carrying on two sticks a cradle with a baby of five to six months. It is frightful to look at—everything is delivered to pillage. . . . I saw also a mother with her *two little ones, one of them with a great wound of the head, the other with an eyeball burst.*"

Private Hassemer (of the Eighth Corps) wrote:

"3-9-1914—At Sommepey (Marne)—Horrible carnage—The village burned to the ground; the French thrown into the burning houses; civilians and all burned together."

Lieutenant Kietzmann (Second Company of the First Battalion of the Forty-ninth Regiment of Infantry) writes under date of August 18th:

"Near Diest lies the little village of Schaffen. About fifty civilians were hidden in the church tower and thence opened fire on our troops with a mitrailleuse—all the civilians were shot."

This does not sound quite so "atrocious," given a state of war. But an interesting sidelight on this execution of "civilians" is thrown on this scrap of diary by a paragraph in the first report of the Belgian Commission of Inquiry. It says:

"Killed at Schaffen, August 18th . . . among others . . . the wife of François Luyckz, aged 45 years, with her little daughter, aged 12. They were discovered in a drain and were shot. The daughter, aged 9, of Jean Ooyen, was shot. André Willem, sexton, was tied to a tree and burned alive."

This, to be sure, is Belgian testimony. But, taken in conjunction with Lieutenant Kietzmann's diary, it seems fair to conclude that some unpleasant things happened at Schaffen on August 18th last.

A Saxon officer (178th Regiment, Twelfth Army Corps, First Corps of Saxony) writes, to his everlasting credit (unfortunately his name was not on his diary):

"August 26.—The attractive village of Gué-d'Hossus (Ardennes), *although it seemed to me innocent*, was delivered to the flames. I am told that a cyclist had fallen from his wheel, his gun going off by accident, then some one had fired in his direction. Therefore all the male inhabitants have simply been thrown into the flames. It is to be hoped that such atrocities (Scheusslichkeiten) will not be repeated."

Philipp —, a private (of Kamenz, in Saxony, First Company, First Battalion, 178th Regiment), on August 23d wrote:

"At ten o'clock this evening the battalion entered a village that had been burned, lying to the north of Dinant. The sight made one shudder. At the entrance to the village lay about fifty villagers, shot for having from ambush fired upon our troops. In the course of the night many others, to the number

of more than two hundred were shot. *Women and children were forced to hold lamps in their hands and thus assist at this horrible spectacle.* Afterwards we ate our rice among the cadavers, as we had not eaten since morning."

Private Schlauter (Third Battery, Fourth Regiment of Field Artillery) wrote, August 25th:

"In Belgium. . . . of the citizens about 300 were shot. *The survivors were requisitioned as grave-diggers. You should have seen the women at that time!* But there was nothing else to do."

Professor Bédier also gives three facsimiles of portions of an article by Under-Officer Klemt, published in the *Jawersches Tageblatt*, October 18, 1914. It is entitled: "A Day of Honor for Our Regiment, 24 September, 1914." His description refers to an incident which occurred near the little village of Hannonville, when, after a skirmish, his soldiers came upon some wounded Frenchmen lying in a little depression.

He says they killed them by clubbing them or running them through. He goes on:

"At my side I hear some peculiar crackings; *they are blows from a gun-butt with which a soldier of our 154th is striking the bald head of a Frenchman;* very wisely he is using for this work a French gun, for fear of breaking his own. The men with especially sensitive souls do the wounded Frenchmen the honor of finishing them with a bullet; but the others hack and hew as hard as they can. Our adversaries had fought courageously . . . but whether they were wounded slightly or gravely our brave fellows saved for their Fatherland the expensive care which it would have been obliged to give to so many enemies."

The accuracy of Klemt's narrative was attested by his

superior, Lieutenant von Niem. The eloquent author of the article asserts that His Royal Highness, Prince Oskar of Prussia, when he heard of the exploits of the 154th, said that it, and a grenadier regiment that made up the brigade, were worthy of the name "Königsbrigade!"

I can spare room for the reproduction of only one of the original pages of these diaries. (See opposite page.)

I have selected my quotations almost at random. There are many more to be found in Prof. Bédier's pamphlet and a much larger number that, as I have said, will be published later in fac-simile, after study and arrangement by an expert cartographer.

It may be that someone who takes the trouble to read them will remain unconvinced. They seem to me conclusive, but may not seem so to everyone.

But, I may ask then, what is the *indisputable* German record as to Belgium?

Thousands of civilians have been killed; tens of thousands have been rendered homeless and are living on charity; many miles of Belgian territory have been occupied by German invaders; the stories of Aerschot, Termonde, Louvain, Liège, Namur, Rheims are known to all; fines of millions of francs have been levied as a punishment for resistance to a brutal breach of neutrality. Is it, after all, worth while to seek for evidence of other atrocities? These are known to, and have been condemned by the whole civilized world. As David Starr Jordan has well expressed it: (54)

"To hack a way through' civilization is the sum of outrages, by whomsoever committed, or whatever the details of the method by which it is accomplished. To consider excuses or apologies for details is in some degree to condone the real offense.

Dorfer nicht. Kein Haus ist
nicht ganz. Alles was
viel von einzelnen
Soldaten requiriert.
Mehrere Häuser müssen
sach man; die stand
verpflichtet zu stehen
müssen. Kleine Häuser
werden mehr & mehr
die Mutter. Einige
liegen an der Kette &
schicken. Ich für
den saufen & stehen
ihnen bräute das
Haus.

Neben der gewaltigen Welt
die Soldat schreibt
auch auch seiner Kunde
in ganz kleinen Dörfern
schon setzen sie die
zu den Hütten gewiss will
durch auf die Hütten
Nun wird die letzte ist.
Wenn sie auch in faire
Waffen gebracht so wie
die dinge die im Verstand
nicht.

Die Gansanten die vord
werden & nicht werden
nach der Bürger werden
nicht gemacht
Istammung der Ver
mündet sind an

Fugordnung

12.8.14. Bis jetzt habe ich mich
nicht bewegt auf, & an

GERMAN TEXT.

See facsimile on reverse side.

"[Von der Wut der Soldaten kann man sich ein Bild machen, wenn man die zerstörten] Dörfer sieht. Kein Haus ist mehr ganz. Alles essbare wird von einzelnen Soldaten requiriert. Mehrere Haufen Menschen sah man, die standrechtlich erschossen wurden. Kleine Schweinchen liefen umher und suchten ihre Mutter. Hunde lagen an der Kette und hatten nichts zu fressen und zu saufen und über ihnen brannten die Häuser.

"Neben der gerechten Wut der Soldaten schreitet aber auch purer Vandalismus. In ganz leeren Dörfer setzen sie den roten Hahn ganz Willkürlich auf die Häuser. Mir tun die Leute leid. Wenn sie auch unfaire Waffen gebrauchen, so verteidigen sie doch nur ihr Vaterland. Die Grausamkeiten die verübt wurden und noch werden von seiten der Bürger werden wust gerächt.

"Verstümmelungen der Verwundeten sind an Tagesordnung."

TRANSLATION.

"August 12, 1914. In Belgium. One gets an idea of the madness of our soldiers when one sees the demolished villages. Not a single house intact. Everything eatable has been taken by the soldiery. I saw many heaps of human beings who had been sentenced and executed. Little pigs ran around among them, seeking their mothers. Dogs, without food or water, were chained among the burning houses. Sheer vandalism was present as well as just anger. To villages already absolutely abandoned our soldiers arbitrarily applied the incendiary torch ("den roten Hahn," "the Red Cock"). The inhabitants made one sorry. If they did employ unfair weapons they were after all defending their Fatherland. The atrocities that those villagers commit or have committed are avenged in a barbarous manner.

"The mutilation of the wounded is a daily routine."

"[From the diary of Private Paul Glöde, of the 9th Battalion of Pioneers (9th Corps)]."

"The huge fact of the crushing of Belgium submerges all details. Our thought is expressed in these words of Emerson: 'What you are speaks so loudly we cannot hear what you say.'"

An American paper (55) has well summed up this aspect of the matter. It says that even if we made the acquittal of the German private soldier as broad and sweeping as it could be made, there have, nevertheless, been atrocities, aside from those attributed to the individual, atrocities committed by the German Government. It continues:

"The German Government sowed the North Sea with mines and blew up harmless trawlers coming from the Scandinavian countries and Holland. The German Government sent airships over Antwerp, Paris, Warsaw, and many undefended and unfortified towns and villages in France, Belgium, and Poland, and scattered death and destruction impartially on home, shop, and farm. The German Government dispatched warships to the coast of England and killed women and children in Whitby, Hartlepool, Scarborough, and Yarmouth. The German Government revived the mediæval custom of holding hostages and killing them if the population from which they came committed any infraction of the rules of war. The German Government held cities for ransom. The German Government has now completed its record of atrocities by declaring a war zone around England and putting the ships of every neutral nation on notice that if they venture into that zone they may be sunk with all on board!

"These are the real atrocities. What difference does it make that exuberant liars in the early days of the war may have ascribed to the German private a ferocity that was not his? Probably he did not cut off the hands of Belgian women; probably he did not spear French babies on his bayonet. But his superior officers had given him a lesson in ruthless brutality, in reversion to barbarity, to seek a parallel for which we should have to go to the Indian raids on the Colonies, and if he omitted to follow that suggestion it is vastly to his credit. The atrocities, if by that word we mean individual cruelty, may be dis-

missed; but how is the German Government going to make its defense at the bar of the civilized world when it is arraigned on the charge of ordering atrocities on a vaster scale than it would ever enter into the mind of a private soldier, however, depraved he might be, to conceive?

"There is an active German propaganda in this country. Its agents are tireless. But there is an agency far more powerful at work in behalf of the cause for which England and France and Russia are fighting. It is the wireless telegraph station at Sayville, which receives and gives out the official reports and declarations of the German Government."

A book (56), which Professor J. H. Morgan has just translated, the notorious "*Kriegsbrauch im Landkriege*" or "German War Book," issued by the German General Staff, for the instruction of officers, is in itself almost sufficient evidence of their inhuman and barbarous methods.

"It asserts the rules of war as they are understood by the Prussian military school, justifying by rote all those practices which have amazed the world at Aerschot, Rheims, and Louvain. The German General Staff, clause by clause, destroys in these pages every safeguard which through centuries of civilizing effort has been erected to soften the rigour of war so far as this may be done consistently with war's purpose. The profession of arms is stripped of all honour. Under the terms of these German regulations the practice of war is not possible to an honorable man. The German officer is required to terrify the helpless into betraying their own people, to murder prisoners, to retain women and children under fire, to levy blackmail upon surrendered cities, to compel the civilian enemy to prepare works for the destruction of his country, to suborn incendiaries and assassins. Upon all these matters the German War-Book is explicit. . . . We will take two instances illustrating the German idea of war. On marching into the enemy-country the German officer is instructed to require from the inhabitants the services of native guides to enable him the more easily to locate and destroy the defenders. Should these unwilling guides lead the invader

astray they must necessarily be shot. The guide, we are told, 'owed obedience to the power in occupation.' He has been guilty of 'passive disobedience' by neglecting to locate his comrades in order that they might be destroyed: 'The leaders of the troops cannot do otherwise than punish the offender with death, since only by harsh measures of defense and intimidation can the repetition of such offences be prevented.' It does not seem to occur to the German War Staff that proceedings which require that civilians shall be shot for refusing to betray their country are in the least blameworthy. Our second instance restores the practices of war as they were understood in the Middle Ages. It has always been held by the historians as a blot upon the fame of a great English King that four hundred years ago the women and children of a French town were refused a free passage through the lines. The *Kriegsbrauch* of modern Germany allows and glorifies an act which four centuries ago was felt to be needlessly inhuman. It is laid down in the German War-Book that the defender of a fortress must not be allowed to strengthen himself by sending away to a place of safety the women, children, old people, and wounded. To allow helpless non-combatants to pass through one's lines is 'in fundamental conflict with the principles of war.' Will not these women, children, old people, and wounded gravely embarrass the defenders? May not their slaughter by shot and shell induce the garrison to surrender a little sooner? 'The very presence of such persons,' says the German book of war, 'may accelerate the surrender of the place in certain circumstances, and it would therefore be foolish of a besieger to renounce voluntarily his advantage.'"

As *The Outlook* said about the raid on Scarborough:
(57)

"The victims were not soldiers, but civilians, and to a large extent women and children. What military advantage commensurate with the effort and risk can come from such a raid is hard to say, but one great disadvantage has resulted. Germany is making a great effort to secure the approval of American sentiment. Such a raid as this nullifies the arguments of German representatives. Americans are not won by exploits that

end in the killing of women and babies; and all the reasoning in the world will not conceal the fact that the raid on Scarborough was an exploit of this kind."

But the question that heads this chapter can hardly be adequately answered by consideration only of the atrocities of war. There are other forms of "atrocities," diplomatic and controversial for example.

The best instance, because at this writing the most recent and most conspicuous, is the effort which Germany and the German apologists are making to shift the responsibility for the Belgian outrage to the shoulders of the Belgians themselves.

This added German crime, this contemptible attempt to make it appear to the American people that Belgium has herself been "guilty" and "criminal" and is merely receiving just chastisement, is so significant that I do not want the opinion I have expressed to seem to be only a personal one.

The matter is adequately dealt with by one of our American paper. (58) It begins:

"It is an evidence, we suppose, of that admirable efficiency which marks the Teutonic character that Germany is still making relentless war upon Belgium—not only against the army, but against the people; not only to destroy the nation's independence, but to blast the good name it has won by heroic sacrifice.

"Were it not for the testimony of Louvain and of the huge war levies extorted from the famine-stricken country, it would be incredible that a civilized government should deliberately seek to traduce a people whom it had already wronged and robbed. Not satisfied with bloody conquest, Germany is determined to strip her victim even of honor—would brand her as guilty of broken faith, the very offense to which Germany herself has officially confessed. The persistence of this campaign makes

it necessary' to keep the record straight before the American people.

"The present attack started a couple of months ago with the announcement that the invaders, rummaging through government papers in Brussels, had found documents proving that 'Belgium violated her own neutrality' in 1906 by agreeing to the landing of British troops in case of war.

"For weeks this odious charge was trumpeted to the world, with all the offensive comment that enmity could invent. Having exhausted the resources of unsupported slander, Germany has at last published the documents, with an adroit elucidation by Dr. Bernhard Dernburg, special publicity agent of Germany in this country."

The editorial then cites the facts as to the violation of the treaty of Belgium and says that, as to them, there is no controversy, as the German Government had confessed its own guilt and pleaded "military necessity." The outburst of condemnation that followed its crime, however, caused this attitude to be abandoned, and the so-called "secret documents" provided a pretense for completing the crushing of Belgium, by denouncing her as a dishonorable plotter against Germany's security.

"Nothing more revolting in its cold-blooded injustice was ever perpetrated in international controversy," the editorial continues, "but the studied effort to heap insult upon injury will make Belgium's case more than ever the cause of civilization."

It then tells the story of the "secret documents," which need not here be set forth (see pp. 263-76), the charge which was falsely and maliciously founded upon them, and goes on:

"When one thinks of the ruined cities and famine-haunted people of Belgium, of the sufferings endured by that nation to keep inviolate its pledged word, it is difficult to characterize adequately the malignant craft of this charge.

"The very documents produced in its support, confidential as they were, recorded in plain terms Belgium's absolute determination to stand by her obligations of neutrality—not only against Germany, but against France or England or any other country—and they as plainly reveal Germany as the sole menace to that neutrality, just as the event proved.

"Yet Doctor Dernburg, who is of course the chief protagonist in this country, has the audacity to cite these memoranda as evidence of what he calls Belgium's 'guilt'! In the hope, no doubt, that Americans would read his preface and ignore the documents themselves, he deliberately suppresses paragraphs which prove Belgium's scrupulous insistence upon her neutrality and Great Britain's steady recognition thereof.

"'Plans had been concerted,' he says, 'to invade Belgium, in 1906.' Here he accuses the British of plotting and the Belgians of consenting to a violation of the treaty of neutrality. He says, further:

"'The imperial Chancellor has declared that there was irrefutable proof that if Germany did not march through Belgium her enemies would. This proof, as now being produced, is of the strongest character.'

"Doctor Dernburg makes his outrageous charge in the face of the following explicit passages in the papers:

"'Colonel Barnardiston (the British attaché) referred to the anxieties of the General Staff of his country with regard to the general political situation and because of the possibility that war may soon break out. In case Belgium should be attacked, the sending of about 100,000 troops was provided for. . . . The landing of the English troops would take place on the French coast in the vicinity of Dunkirk and Calais. The entry of the English into Belgium would take place only after the violation of our neutrality by Germany.' "These provisos, carefully avoided by the German publicity agent, prove that the projected British 'invasion' was to take place only in the event of and following a German invasion. The arrangement was as creditable to Great Britain—a guarantor of the neutrality treaty—as the unprovoked assault last August by Germany was dishonorable. The 'guilt' of Belgium consisted in consulting the neighbors as to what should be done in case of an expected incursion by a burglar.

"The event shows that the precaution was eminently justified,

and that Britain's offense lay not in plans of aggression, but in unpreparedness to fulfill her obligations to defend the neutrality she had guaranteed.

"Exactly the same condition applies to the 1912 memorandum. Belgium therein gave notice that even to save her territory she would not yield to a British landing made without her consent. And that landing, also, was to be made only in case Germany had first forsworn her pledged word and had violated the neutrality for which she was in part responsible.

"A third Dernburg paragraph almost answers itself. The government that would speak of the 'guilt of Belgian' all but forfeits its place in the family of nations.

"Germany's intention to invade Belgium instantly on the outbreak of war had been proclaimed and advertised and boasted for years in the published works of her military strategists. If Belgium had not 'concerted plans' with Britain and France to defend herself, she would have been guilty of supreme folly; and if Great Britain had not prepared for action to follow a German assault upon Belgium, she would have been false to her pledged word.

"The complaint that Belgium did not 'approach' Germany in the same manner is surely the very acme of irony, for she had already received notice that Germany would tear up the 'scrap of paper' to which her imperial pledge had been given, and would invoke 'necessity, which knows no law.'

"But abstract arguments and documentary evidence alike can be put aside when the world examines the actual events. No advocacy can explain away the facts that Belgium was true to her neutrality; that France did not violate it; that Great Britain did not, and that Germany did; that German armies had been for some time overrunning Belgium before a French or British detachment set foot on the violated territory.

"'Only our prompt action at Liège,' says Doctor Dernburg, with astounding hardihood, 'prevented the English landing and invading Belgium.' Evidently he thinks Americans never saw a map of Belgium; the taking of Liège could not possibly interfere with a British invasion—as a fact, the city has been held by the Germans for months, yet the landing of British troops has never been interfered with.

"Equally deceptive is the generality that 'all Belgium's fortresses are on the eastern frontier.' Namur is near the

border of France, and could not possibly menace a German army unless that army had penetrated one-third way across Belgium.

"Doctor Dernburg is more himself when he frankly states that 'the Belgian people had been told at the beginning of the war that Germany demanded that the Belgian force should fight with the Germans against the French and English.' This was the true German conception of neutrality and of the 'scrap of paper' to which her imperial word was attached.

"We have given this much space to a renewed discussion of the Belgian question because it is, to Americans, the vital issue of the war. It embraces rights and principles which are fundamental to every nation's security and the very permanence of civilization. And most neutrals will give small heed to German pleas about 'Russian barbarism,' 'French revenge' or 'British greed' while the corpse of Belgium's murdered nationality appeals for justice.

"The violation of that country was a moral, a legal and an international offense for which there can be no excuse and no palliation. It was a barbarous wrong, a defiance to civilization, an act of perfidy without parallel in history; because it was committed in an age when the obligations of honor and decency are stronger than at any other period of human development.

"There are issues of the war the responsibility for which must be shared with Germany by other countries. But concerning Belgium her guilt is unique and undivided. And it will grow more odious with every effort she makes to shift it to her victim, though she produces documents enough to choke the Kiel canal."

I do not apologize for the space I have given here and elsewhere to the case of Belgium *vs.* Germany. It is not only to Americans "the vital issue of the war" as regards things past. It is also of supreme importance in all its relations; in the cold-blooded perpetration of the crime, in the barefaced avowal that it *was* a crime, in the deceitful withdrawal of that avowal when the outraged moral sense of the world was realized, in the clumsy, blundering efforts to explain it away, in the barbarous atrocities that

followed it, and finally in this last contemptible attempt by the juggling of documents, the glossing over of essential sentences, the actual suppression of important paragraphs, to make it seem to the American people, that Belgium, if she is, by ill fate, destined to disappear from the face of the earth, does so as a shameful suicide instead of as the victim of a brutal international murder.

The question at the head of this chapter is most certainly and unhesitatingly to be answered in the negative.

CHAPTER V.

In What Estimation Does America To-day Hold Belgium?

If time had permitted that the opportunity be offered there would have been a thousand American contributions to the tribute paid to the King of Belgium, known as "King Albert's Book." Colonel Roosevelt, for example, who is as well known to all peoples of the world as any living American, and as much respected, does not appear as a contributor. But he has, characteristically and unequivocally expressed his views in his book, just published: (59)

"Luxembourg made no resistance. It is now practically incorporated in Germany. Other nations have almost forgotten its existence and not the slightest attention has been paid to its fate; simply because it did not fight; simply because it trusted solely to peaceful measures and to the treaties which were supposed to guarantee it against harm. The eyes of the world, however, are on Belgium because the Belgians have fought hard and gallantly for all that makes life best worth having to honorable men and women. In consequence, Belgium has been trampled under foot. At this moment not only her men but her women and children are enduring misery so dreadful that it is hard for us who live at peace to visualize it to ourselves."

* * * * *

"When once Belgium was invaded, every circumstance of national honor and interest forced England to act precisely as she did act. She could not have held up her head among nations had she acted otherwise. In particular, she is entitled to the praise of all true lovers of peace, for it is only by action such as she took that neutrality treaties and treaties guaranteeing the rights of small powers will ever be given any value. The actions of Sir Edward Grey as he guided Britain's

foreign policy showed adherence to lofty standards of right combined with firmness of courage under great strain."

* * * * *

"There is one nation, however, as to which there is no room for difference of opinion, whether we consider her wrongs or the justice of her actions. It seems to me impossible that any man can fail to feel the deepest sympathy with a nation which is absolutely guiltless of any wrongdoing, which has given proof of high valor, and yet which has suffered terribly, and which, if there is any meaning in the words 'right' and 'wrong,' has suffered wrongfully. Belgium is not in the smallest degree responsible for any of the conditions that during the last half century have been at work to impress a certain fatalistic stamp upon those actions of Austria, Russia, Germany, and France which have rendered this war inevitable. No European nation has had anything whatever to fear from Belgium. There was not the smallest danger of her making any aggressive movement, not even the slightest aggressive movement, against any of her neighbors. Her population was mainly industrial and was absorbed in peaceful business. Her people were thrifty, hard-working, highly civilized, and in no way aggressive. She owed her national existence to the desire to create an absolutely neutral State. Her neutrality had been solemnly guaranteed by the great Powers, including Germany as well as England and France.

"Suddenly, and out of a clear sky, her territory was invaded by an overwhelming German army." . . .

"The Germans are in Belgium from no fault of the Belgians, but purely because the Germans deemed it to their vital interest to violate Belgium's rights. Therefore the ultimate responsibility for what has occurred at Louvain, and what has occurred and is occurring in Brussels rests upon Germany and in no way upon Belgium. The invasion could have been averted by no action of Belgium that was consistent with her honor and self-respect. The Belgians would have been less than men had they not defended themselves and their country." . . .

"The prime fact as regards Belgium is that Belgium was an entirely peaceful and genuinely neutral power which had been guilty of no offence whatever. What has befallen her is due to the further fact that a great, highly civilized military power

deemed that its own vital interests rendered imperative the infliction of this suffering on an inoffensive although valiant and patriotic little nation."

These writings of Colonel Roosevelt represent the opinion—the fixed, unalterable, intense and practically unanimous opinion of all Americans, except that portion of the German-Americans that has been allowed to represent—or misrepresent—they in public. This opinion is no less well set forth by the following distinguished Americans who contributed to "King Albert's Book."

"Under the gallant lead of the heroic Belgian King, his downtrodden and afflicted people have been fighting for liberty, and to maintain the plighted faith of nations, which guaranteed it to them. Those who were guilty of an awful breach of faith, confessed their crime while in the act of committing it, and pleaded necessity to absolve them from all law, a plea which the whole civilized world refuses to accept.

"For their bold stand for right and duty, the Belgians, guiltless of all offense, have been overwhelmed by numbers, trampled in the dust, and reduced to starvation, their homes destroyed, their whole country devastated and converted into a human slaughter-house.

"In this sad plight, they have deserved and are receiving the sympathy and the helping hand of people of every civilized nation in this hour of their dire distress.

"I am glad to know that my countrymen are sending material relief to the sufferers, and with it the hearts of our people go out to them and their brave king, in human sympathy, unfeigned and unrestrained.

"As neutrals, by international law and by our own law, our hands are tied and will remain so. But our hearts go whither they list."—*Hon. Joseph H. Choate.*

"BELGIUM

"Ruined? Destroyed? Ah, no; though blood in rivers ran
Down all her ancient streets; though treasures manifold
Love-wrought, time-mellowed, and beyond the price of gold
Are lost, yet Belgium's star shines still in God's vast plan.

"Rarely have kings been great, since kingdoms first began;
Rarely have great kings been great men, when all was told.
But, by the lighted torch in mailed hands, behold
Immortal Belgium's immortal king, and man."

—*Ella Wheeler Wilcox.*

"La Belgique ne regrette rien."

"Not with her ruined silver spires,
Not with her cities shamed and rent,
Perish the imperishable fires
That shape the homestead from the tent.

"Wherever men are staunch and free,
There shall she keep her fearless state,
And, homeless, to great nations be
The home of all that makes them great."

—*Edith Wharton.*

"The proposed tribute is part of the debt of honor and reverence which is due from the whole world to that most nobly heroic people and the prince who has shown himself worthy of them. The tragedy of their great little land is of a pathos matchless in the history of the past; and in the future when, as we all hope, the military spirit of Germany shall be brought low, I believe the Germans themselves will share our horror of the ruin they have wrought among its homes and shrines.—*William Dean Howells.*

"Belgium is rare; Belgium is unique. Among men arises on rare occasions a great man, a man of cosmic import; among nations on rare occasions arises a great nation, a nation of cosmic import. Such a nation is Belgium. Such is the place Belgium attained in a day by one mad, magnificent, heroic leap into the azure. As long as the world rolls and men live, that long will Belgium be remembered. All the human world owes, and will owe, Belgium a debt of gratitude such as was never earned by any nation in the history of nations. It is a magnificent debt, a proud debt that all the nations of men will sacredly acknowledge."—*Jack London.*

"We have experienced so many emotions in America in the course of this terrible war that it would be difficult, had not Germany violated the neutrality of Belgium, to assert definitely

what has been our dominant sensation. But, as it is, I think I can safely speak for my countrymen, and state that nothing has so horrified us and aroused our indignation and sympathies as the cruel fate of this valiant little country.

"Above all, no chapter of the war, as yet presented to us, has so excited our admiration as well as our profound respect. We are the only country, owing to our geographical position as well as to our facilities, that has been able to look at all sides of the European imbroglio from the beginning; and propaganda has made no impression whatever upon us. We have had the opportunity to make up our minds, and wholly out of order as this would appear in certain quarters, we believe ourselves to be quite equal to this feat without exterior assistance. We know, among many other things, that the magnificent resistance at Liège upset all the long-matured plans of the German War Office, and that had Belgium proved either weak or ignoble, the history of the war would be very different reading to-day.

"I venture to say that every town in the United States, big and little, has its Belgian Relief Society, even if it does not spread beyond the dimensions of the weekly sewing circle; and that the most consistent democrat in the country takes off his hat to King Albert of Belgium. The Americans are always alert to recognize a MAN, and are capable of being quite indifferent to the niche presented to him by destiny. What he does in that niche is the point. If the result of this upheaval is a great European Republic (I refer, of course, to the Continent), I feel positive that if the people of the United States of America were allowed to vote, the popular candidate would be King Albert of Belgium."—*Gertrude Atherton*.

This chapter might, by extracts from current American literature, be almost indefinitely prolonged. But quite sufficient additional American testimony will be found in Chapters III, IV, X and XI, and indeed, throughout the book, to justify the statement that everywhere in America to-day the words "I am a Belgian" would, as in the Australian's thrilling war poem (p. 88), bring instant evidence of deep sympathy and profound respect.

CHAPTER VI.

Is There Any Evidence Which Tends to Show Why the Present Time Was Selected by Germany to Precipitate the War?

Professor Usher, the author of "Pan-Germanism" (where much interesting matter corroborative of the statements of Emil Reich, as to Germany's megalomania, may be found presented in a more dignified way), has best answered this question in an article on "The Reasons Behind the War." (60)

In the first place, Austria for centuries has dreamed of dominating southeastern Europe, of ruling the Balkans, of possessing a seacoast on the Adriatic and *Ægean*. Only the control of Servia can give her fully and unreservedly what she desires. Moreover, under Servia's leadership, once she had recovered from her great losses in men and resources during the Balkan wars, a strong Slav state might have been established in control of all Austria's present approaches to the Adriatic. Her motives seem plain, and she was in precisely the position, after the murder of the Arch-Duke Ferdinand, to serve as a cat's-paw for her "ally"—and master. But why did the latter push her relentlessly into war at this time, when ample reparation was offered and further amends were easily procurable, as the evidence shows beyond all question? The Anglo-Irish difficulties, the Canadian-Hindu troubles, the sensational disclosures in the French Chamber as to the bad condition of the army, the alleged deficiencies in the French areoplane squadrons, the only partial recovery of

Russia from the effects of the Japanese war, the exhaustion of the Balkan States themselves from their recent wars, even the preoccupation of the United States with troubles in Mexico, all seemed to preclude the chance of a general interference.

Professor Usher continues:

"If such interference took place and a general European war resulted, there had not been in twenty years anything like as favorable an opportunity for the Triple Alliance or one as disadvantageous for the Triple Entente. The stake was so immense, the results of success would be so stupendous, so out of proportion, in the case of the Triple Alliance, with what they might lose, that the issue of war might even be courted with some assurance. . . .

"The schemes of the Pan-Germanists indeed reach to the creation of a vast confederation of states. . . . reaching 'from the North Sea to the Persian Gulf, from the Baltic to the Mediterranean,' as one of their slogans has it. . . .

"Of this great scheme (supposing it to be, as many claim, the veritable policy of the Triple Alliance) the undisputed possession of the Balkans by the Triple Alliance is the most important single factor. . . .

"As to a general assault upon the Triple Entente the Triple Alliance has long seen two obvious methods, both in the opinion of many, likely to be successful; the one, a long waiting game where the rapid growth of the population in Germany, Austria, and Italy, and the decline of the rate of growth in France, England, and Russia, would in time give the Alliance a real preponderance in numbers; the other, a short quick blow at some moment when the Triple Alliance could bring all its strength to bear and when the Triple Entente could not. The former meant, not improbably, many years of waiting, and in those years much might happen.

"Thoroughly alive to the situation, the Triple Entente had already under execution the preliminaries of so vast an increase of offensive force, and showed such a determination to maintain a naval and military preponderance, that there would be no alternative but waiting, once these schemes were perfected.

The French, and particularly the Russian, army was to be increased, not only in size, but in efficiency and equipment; and an influential minority in England, with apparent popular support, was agitating conscription. The English navy was to be much increased in fighting force by manning at war strength in the near future a much larger proportion of ships than ever before. Chiefest of all, the Russians were building in the Baltic a really formidable fleet, capable of contesting the Baltic with Germany and of threatening the rear of the German fleet in the Atlantic to such an extent that united fleet action in the North Sea would become an impossibility.

"If they [the Triple Alliance] were to fight at all, they must fight now. Next summer might be too late. Now the actual offensive force of their rivals was proportionately less than it might be again for ten years, and their difficulties at home were collectively and individually greater than any of the three has seen for a generation.

"So far as the fulfillment of the schemes of Pan-Germanism was concerned, the moment was more than opportune and might not return."

Professor Usher seems to me to have sufficiently answered Question VI.

CHAPTER VII.

What Are the Principles Represented by the Opposing Forces In This War?

A. They are absolutism and militarism on the one hand and democratic liberty and representative government on the other.

For a century a transference of political power from military despots to popular assemblies has been going on in Western Europe. In Russia and the Far East the same gradual shift of forces has been taking place. France and Portugal are republics. England is democratic. Japan has abandoned feudalism for democracy. China is an experimental republic. Russia has her Duma. Servia has fought for self-government. The people of Italy have shown their real sentiments by keeping her from fighting against the Allies. Belgium has a growing and intelligent democratic minority of its population. At this critical tide in the affairs of the world the inmost feelings of the peoples involved, the beliefs and aspirations that are a living part of their very being are apt to dominate and often—though I admit, not invariably—determine their action.

What is the alignment?

On one side Germany—with whose ideals and purposes we are familiar—Austria, not a real nation, but an artificial conglomeration of heterogeneous peoples, the mere tool of Germany, and Turkey, now, as always, the type of a corrupt fanatic Oriental despotism.

On the other, France, England, Belgium, Servia, Portugal, Russia, Japan.

And ranged on their side, so far as sympathy goes, are the democratic neutral powers, Denmark, Norway, Holland, Italy and the United States.

The Outlook, which has admirably summed up the foregoing facts, says editorially: (61)

"When in a chemical experiment certain molecules by a natural attraction combine, that fact shows that they have something in common. When, in such a war as this, France, England, Belgium, Portugal, Japan and Russia combine, that fact shows that these various peoples have something in common. We believe that something in common is a passionate desire for democratic liberty.

"The victory of Germany can be no other than a victory for militarism; the victory of the Allies no other than a victory for permanent peace. If Germany wins she must maintain her armaments, if not increase them; for power obtained by force can be maintained only by force. If Germany is defeated, a diminution of her armaments as a condition of peace may well be demanded by the Allied Powers."

Dr. Dernburg has, with great pains, tried to portray for the benefit of Americans, a Germany which will excite their admiration. He sneers (62) at Chesterton, Caine, Wells, Doyle and Bennett as "writers of fiction." If any one of them ever wrote a story or a novel less convincing than the "official" and "unimpeachable" documents of Germany and its representatives during this present war, we have failed to see it. As a writer of "fiction," Doctor Dernburg is himself entitled, in everything but interest and plausibility, to rank with any one of them. His versions of the Chancellor's speech to the Reichstag, and of Germany's "solemn declaration" to our Department of State, would alone suffice to class him with Hall Caine. "Germany," he asserts, "has no special grudge against anybody." He forgets his Goethe: "Ein echter deutscher Mann

mag keinen Franzen leiden. Doch ihre Weine trinkt er gern." "Grudge" crops out of every sentence of his paper; grudge against England, grudge against France, grudge against "poor little" Belgium (it is *his* sneer we quote), and against Russia. If the United States escape such obvious ill will, this may be due to his extraordinary sense of "obligation as a guest." At least, as we have seen, he intimates that we have von Bernhardis in this country, and that he would shame us by naming them if he were free to do so!

The Germany described by Doctor Dernburg is one which few Americans will recognize. Grudgeless, "fighting morally for her freedom and her existence," "modest," wanting merely her oft-claimed "place under the sun"; "out for conquest on a peaceful line," "the line where the higher culture wins"; a "democracy," "directed by the most liberal ballot law that exists, even more liberal than the one in use in the United States." Only the last of these statements deserves passing mention, and this because it might delude some American who had not time to inform himself.

The "democracy" so eulogized is no more a democracy in our sense, or in the French sense, or in the English sense (despite the monarchical form of the British government) than it is a Court of Archangels. As Mr. Mencken says, it is not "a democracy in the American sense, or anything colorably resembling it. It was founded upon no romantic theory that all men were natural equals." Nietzsche reserved Brotherhood for "shopkeepers, cows, women and Englishmen."

It is a "democracy" in which the vote of one Prussian Junker is equal in political effect to the votes of many men of lower class.

It is a "democracy" with 3,000,000 officials for 14,000,-

000 electors, or, roughly speaking, "one policeman to every five adults" (Price Collier).

It is a "democracy" in which, as Sarolea said in 1912, every part of the empire has theoretically a proportional share in the administration, while Prussia really enjoys the ultimate political and financial control.

It is a "democracy" which Professor McElroy entitles a "half Slavonic military despotism, calling its war chief the 'anointed of the Lord,' and to maintain and extend which the Germans are giving their lives."

It is a "democracy" with an "Overlord" who can seriously say: (Bremen, 1897)

"If we have been able to accomplish what has been accomplished, it is due above all things to the fact that our house" (the Hohenzollerns) "possesses a tradition by virtue of which we consider that we have been appointed by God to preserve and direct for their own welfare the people over whom He has given us power."

And still later, only four years ago: (1910, Königsberg)

"It was in this spot that my grandfather, in his own right placed the royal crown of Prussia upon his head, insisting once again that it was bestowed upon him by the grace of God alone, and not by parliaments, and meetings, and decisions of the people. He thus regarded himself as the chosen instrument of Heaven, and as such carried out his duties as a ruler and lord. I consider myself such an instrument of Heaven, and shall go my way without regard to the views and opinions of the day."

Prince Henry of Prussia, the Kaiser's brother, declared that he was actuated by one single motive: "A desire to proclaim to the nations the gospel of Your Majesty's sacred person, and to preach that gospel alike to those who will listen and those who will not."

This German "democracy" is blessed with a Parliament, concerning which so well informed a writer as Collier can say: "Why should the press or society take this assembly very seriously, when as the most important measure of which they are capable they can vote to have themselves dismissed by declining to pass supply bills, and when, as has happened four times in their history, they return chastened, tame, and amenable to the wishes of their master?" Mr. Collier affirms that after forty odd years the Germans are still without real representative government.

It is a "democracy" in which the battle cry is "World power or perish"; in which there is an Overlord who says: "Only one is master of this country. That is I. Who opposes me I shall crush to pieces"; in which for a generation the toast of the ruling class has been "Der Tag," "The Day," when they should be let loose by their masters to work havoc and destruction; the day for which the masses, the people, the "electors," had been more or less unwillingly preparing, and on which, as a reward for their toil and energy and self-sacrifice, they were allowed to become "cannon fodder" for the glory of the War Lord.

This question of the democracy of Germany has a portentous significance from another viewpoint.

As to one of the theoretical results of the war, by many still widely believed in and hoped for, viz., that after the German people realized the failure of the initial campaign and came to see the inner causes and springs of the hopeless war in which they are engaged, they would wrest authority from the hands of those who had misused it and found a New Germany, an American paper (63) has admirably expressed the unfortunate truth. Its editorial historical summary is so enlightening at this juncture that I quote it almost in full, although I am not in accord as to one

point, viz., the "absolute unity" of the German people (see pp. 461-71).

"One of the earliest predictions made concerning the war was that it would result in a revolution in Germany; that imperialism, militarism and autocracy would be submerged beneath the tides of an awakened democracy.

"It was a plausible theory, and still has its hopeful supporters. They will be likely to reject the opinion expressed in the *Pall Mall Gazette*:

"The *New York Times* speculates on the possibility of a German revolution under the impetus of disaster. Prophecy is hazardous, but nothing in German history discloses either the initiative or the capacity to bring such a movement to fruition. Germany has always had her political shape and her political thought imposed upon her by strong wills and strong hands.'

"Many who are familiar with world history will resent so harsh a sneer. They know that the very cradle of human liberty was in the historic land of Germany. . . .

"It would seem the limit of absurdity and injustice to say that the German people of modern times are incapable of freeing themselves from autocracy.

"But the singular fact is that history declares the theory, up to this time, to be true. For three centuries the peoples of all the earth—except the Germans—have been struggling toward democracy. Literally, every nation worthy of the name—excepting Germany—has had its revolts and revolutions, its over-turning of dynasties and tyrannical governments.

The German people alone have been satisfied. They have warred with everybody but their rulers. Emperors, kings, petty princes and grand dukes by the score, by the hundred, have maintained their sway over contented populations. The house of Hohenzollern, now ruling the empire, has reigned over Brandenburg and Prussia in unbroken line for exactly 500 years. There is not another royal family, probably, which can boast such uninterrupted domination. . . .

"Glancing at the record of the last 300 years, we find that every other country in Europe, all of America and half of Asia have had their great, impulsive movements toward democracy, but that in Germany the liberal institutions which do exist

have been handed down by an autocracy which thereby has perpetuated its own power.

"There has never been in that country a successful revolution, and no apparent desire for one. The history of Germany is a history of great sovereigns, great generals, great writers and philosophers; but there is in it no great liberator. The birth-place of religious and intellectual freedom, the cradle of the race that has carried democracy to the ends of the earth, it has itself never known political freedom. It can commemorate the glories of a Leipsic and a Sadowa, but not of a Lexington or a Yorktown.

"The power of the Hohenzollern dynasty was really founded by the Great Elector, Frederick William of Brandenburg (1640-1688), whose son Frederick was first King of Prussia (1701-1713), and was succeeded by Frederick William I (1713-1740). Let us see what Europe was doing while the first of these sovereigns was creating a State, the second feebly living out his term and the third was winning immortality by collecting regiments of giant grenadiers.

"In 1640 Portugal threw off the yoke of Spain, which it had worn for sixty years. Two years later came the great civil war in England, which was to last until, seven years later, a despotic king was put to death by the people whose rights he had invaded.

"In 1688 the British spirit of freedom, inherited from Teutonic ancestors, drove the last of the wayward Stuarts from the throne. It was this revolution which reduced the power of the State in behalf of individual liberty and self-government, and not the French revolution, which extended the power of the State by destroying aristocratic privileges, that was the true forerunner of the American revolution. But it had no echo, then or at any other time, in Germany.

"Passing over one of Poland's many revolts—in 1706 she forced her Saxon king to abdicate—we glance at the reign of Frederick the Great (1740-1786). Russia had a dynastic revolution, the reactionary Peter III being dethroned by Catherine II, whose vigorous sway introduced Western civilization, promoted commerce, founded schools and granted religious liberty. In 1772 the people of Sweden, led by Gustavus III, crushed the power of the arrogant nobles and established constitutionalism.

"The enlightened despotism of Frederick lifted Prussia to the

rank of the first military power in Europe. He performed prodigies for the material and intellectual advancement of the kingdom; but its people gave no response to the epoch-making summons of the American revolution. In the year he died the patient Dutch dethroned an aristocratic monarch.

"The reigns of Frederick William II, III and IV covered three-quarters of a century, 1786-1861. Yet only once during this, perhaps the most restless period in the history of politics, did the people of Prussia and the other German States reveal signs of discontent with the rigorous rule imposed upon them.

"In 1787 Belgium freed herself from Austria and set up a republic, although three years later she accepted the old system, modified by a constitution. A little later came the cataclysm of the French revolution; and while it caused some aspirations in Germany toward freedom, its excesses were so alarming that German armies were sent to support the doomed autocracy in France.

"Napoleon simply used the German States as counters in his titanic game of empire. He shuffled them as though they had been cards; squeezed the 300 of them into 38; bestowed crowns as though they were tips. The very brutality of his iron sway resulted finally in arousing a martial spirit, and it was Prussian valor that at the last rose up and smote his empire to dust.

"Yet it is to be noted that the German people were still faithful to their royal leaders. In 1795 Poland had risen under Kosciusko, and the Netherlands had established the Batavian republic, which lasted as long as that of France. Two years later Switzerland had also followed the inspiration of the great revolution. In 1809 Sweden deposed an unsatisfactory monarch; in 1813 the Netherlands expelled the French and restored the house of Orange, and in 1814 Napoleon was overthrown; but during all this time the inhabitants of the German States remained unmoved.

"It was a time of tremendous literary activity; but among all the great writers—Goethe, Kant, Schiller, Fichte, Richter and a score of others—though the world was racked with the birth-pangs of democracy, there was none to inspire his countrymen with aspirations toward political liberty. Some of the German sovereigns were absolutists, some granted constitutions; but the mass of the people remained indifferent. The few who declaimed about freedom did nothing else to achieve it.

"Between 1822 and 1830 Greece revived the glories of her ancient valor and won her independence from the Turk. The last-named year saw the Poles drive out the Russians, Belgium win her independence from Holland and France dismiss the last of the Bourbons. Spain indulged in a civil war in 1834, and two years later forced her sovereign to swear to maintain a violated constitution. In 1843 Greece extorted a constitution likewise from her Bavarian king.

The stormiest year of the nineteenth century was 1848, with revolutions in France, Italy, Hungary and elsewhere. Then, for the first and only time, the German people revealed a vigorous sense of political independence. While France was dethroning Louis Philippe and setting up the second republic, Bavaria forced the abdication of her king, Baden produced a feeble revolt and Berlin a few days of barricades in the streets. The end of it all was the exile of the liberal leaders—some of whom became great Americans—and the establishment in Prussia and other States of constitutions which were merely tinged with democracy.

"A little later began the era of Bismarck, creator of the German empire. Its rise has been one of the wonders of the world; *but no one, least of all intelligent Germans themselves, will pretend that it is democratic.*

"In 1852 France returned to the imperial idea. In 1860 Garibaldi began the struggle which unified Italy. In 1862 Greece deposed her Bavarian sovereign and gave the crown to a Danish prince. In 1868 Japan abolished feudalism and adopted Western ideas. Between 1868 and 1874 the Spaniards changed their government three times. And 1871 saw the establishment of the French republic, that has proved its vigor against the vast armies of imperial Germany.

The twentieth century, young as it is, has seen movements toward democracy in the Balkan States, in Russia, in Portugal, in Turkey and in China, two of these having become republics. But throughout all this period the German people have remained the willing subjects of a highly efficient but uncompromising autocracy. . . .

"Germany takes her greatest pride to-day, not in the valor of her troops, but in the absolute unity of her people. There is not one of them who by a word or breath will admit that a single act of the autocracy, from Austria's criminal ultimatum

to the extortion of blackmail from starving Belgium, has failed in the remotest degree in justice.

"From the standpoint of patriotism this is admirable; from the standpoint of civilization it is ominous. Three-fourths of the world condemns the conflict as a needless and brutal crime of misgovernment; yet in the whole German people there is no voice raised in behalf of humanity or in condemnation of the false and barbarous philosophy that exalts militarism and provokes aggressive conquest.

"There could hardly be more striking evidences of that habit of docility which yields veneration to autocratic power and sacrifices liberty to attain a machine-made efficiency.

"The world's debt to Germany is vast; to her it owes music, philosophy, religious and intellectual emancipation. But as a nation she remains insensible to political freedom.

"In this day of democracy the absolute surrender of individualism to an autocratic State, so that among a whole people there is not a single variation of thought or utterance upon the mightiest and most complex problem that ever confronted the world, is a painful spectacle, from which humanity will derive no inspiration and to which it will pay no admiring tribute."

The following acute summary (64) of the German views, ideals, ambitions and purposes of to-day sets forth at the same time the over-weening confidence and preposterous self-satisfaction of the German leaders:

"The objects of Prussia's ambition—an ambition shared by every anemic bespectacled clerk and able-bodied tram conductor in the Fatherland—are 'cultural,' and the means of achieving them are heavy guns, quick-firers, and millions of ruthless warriors. Real German culture in all its manifestations—scientific, artistic, philosophical, musical, commercial, and military, accepts and champions the new principle and the fresh ideas which are to regenerate the effete social organisms of to-day. According to the theory underlying this grandiose national enterprise, the forces of Christianity are spent. New ichor for the dry veins of decrepit Europe is stored up in German philosophy and poetry. Mediæval art has exhausted the traditional forms, but Teutonism is ready to furnish it with new ones. Music is almost a creation of German genius. Commerce was

stagnating in the ruts of old-world use and wont until German enterprise created new markets for it, and infused a new spirit into its trading community. Applied science owes more to German research and ingenuity than to the efforts of all the world besides. And the race thus highly gifted is deserving of a field worthy of its world-regenerating labors. At present it is cooped up in Central Europe with an absurdly small coast-line. Its surplus population has, for lack of colonies, to be dumped down on foreign shores, where it is lost forever to the Fatherland. For this degrading position, which can no longer be tolerated, there is but one remedy: expansion. But to be effectual it must be expansion combined with Germanization. And the only means of accomplishing this end is for Germany to hack her way through the decrepit ethnic masses that obstruct her path and to impose her higher civilization on the natives. Poland was the first vile body on which this experiment was tried, and it has been found, and authoritatively announced, that the Slavs are but ethnic manure, useful to fertilize the seed-fields of Teutonic culture, but good for little else. The Latin races, too, are degenerates who live on memories and thrive on tolerance. Beef-eating Britons are the incarnation of base hypocrisy and crass self-indulgence, and their empire, like a hollow tree, still stands only because no storm has yet assailed it. To set youthful, healthy, idealistic Germany in the high places now occupied by those inert masses that once were progressive nations, is but to adjust obsolete conditions to the pressing requirements of the present time—to execute the wise decrees of a just God. And in order to bring this task to a satisfactory issue, militarism must reign as the paramount power before culture can ascend the throne. Militarism is a necessity, and unreasoning obedience the condition of its success.”

In a most excellent article Dr. Ellis Oberholtzer, of Philadelphia (65), reviews a portion of the same field, and shows the absolute domination of Germany by Prussia, the Hohenzollerns, the aristocracy and the multi-millionaires. He calls attention to the Dreiklassen system, by which all the voters in a district are divided into three

classes according to their taxable wealth, and goes on:

"Thus in the first class the very wealthy elected one-third of the members of a kind of electoral college, those in the second class, the less wealthy, elected a third, while the masses of the people, bundled into a class by themselves, chose another third. . . .

"In this system no change has been made, though the constitution was promulgated more than sixty years ago. In Essen, when I lived in Germany, Herr Krupp, the gunmaker, and Bismarck, who owned some property in that town, formed one class, a score or more lesser magnates another class. Their influence and power were as two to one against the thousands of workmen and small tradesmen thrown together into the third class."

He says that there are districts in East Prussia in which 95 or even 99 per cent. of the people cast but one-third of the votes for a member of the Prussian Diet. He brings the matter home to us by saying that it is as if Pennsylvania had a king, "by the grace of God," who was also Emperor of the United States. He would choose his own ministers from a land-holding aristocracy. The Senate or upper house of legislature would be a House of Lords with the selection of whom the people would have nothing to do. The House of Representatives would be made up of members chosen from time to time by the rich men in each district of the State. The government could not be changed except by consent of the king and of an hereditary noble hierarchy surrounding the throne. "In this," he says "do popular government and the parliamentary system consist in Prussia, which is two-thirds of the German Empire in population and three-thirds in the domination and control of German affairs." He speaks of the absence of anything corresponding to what we know as "freedom of speech" or "liberty of the press," and continues:

"But an American or English editor could not patiently write for newspapers held in such restraint and exerting so little influence upon public opinion. It is necessary for the publisher to carry a copy of every issue to the police station before the presses run off the edition and to print in plain view the name of a *verantwortliche redacteur*, or responsible, answerable editor. This man, in the case of some of the Socialist papers, has been hired for the use. He goes to jail; another who takes his place follows him into durance vile, while the actual editor still continues daily to take his flings at the government. And not all the editors who have been imprisoned in these forty years have been Socialists. The more moderate radicals have sometimes been visited by the police to be withdrawn for a time from the sunshine.

"What makes the way of the journalist particularly difficult, although the general libel laws are harsh, is the *unverletzliche*, or inviolable character of the Kaiser, and he is holy twice over, once because he is the German Emperor and again because he is the King of Prussia. He is so much in the German scheme of government by force of law, and by his assumption of prerogatives (through the exercise of many of the chancellor's powers since the dismissal of Bismarck), and his general meddling in all manner of questions by his pronouncements which he issues as a vicergerent of God, that free political discussion in the press is out of the question. A great excellency of the English democracy is found in the open and unceasing debate of the merits of public men. The one great public man in Germany is removed from the province of debate, unless it should be in the line of adulation.

"The press has never reached any degree of respectable public influence in Germany. When it finally escaped actual daily censorship it found itself at the mercy of Bismarck, who used a so-called Guelfh fund, belonging to the Duke of Cumberland, in the Prussian Treasury. He seized the income to bribe the press. With advertisements and subsidies, by withholding information from one paper and giving it to another, by prosecuting an editor who attacked him as chancellor and sparing another who lashed the enemies of Prussian policy, by feeding the 'reptiles,' as men called them, because they crawled at his feet, he made the freedom of the press the travesty it has always been. The newspaper as an organ of public opinion has not

succeeded in raising itself to a much greater height since the passing of Bismarck's extraordinary regime.

"If the laws relating to *lèse majesté* fail, the police authorities can turn to the famous clause in the penal code relating to *Grober Unfug*, the committing of a gross nuisance. This term covers a multitude of sins—the objectionable yelping of dogs, the indecent public exposure of the human person and, by test in the courts of justice, the misbehavior of newspaper editors, touching subjects of government. So much for the liberty of the press in Germany. . . .

"But the seat and center of the monarch's power is in the army. He is its absolute head. Under its influence at one time or another comes every male German fit to carry a gun. The recruit is put under drill sergeants, always chosen from the noble junker or monarchical classes, and trained for a term of years to military efficiency and implicit obedience of his commanders. These soldiers are set down among the people in fortresses and barracks in every part of the empire. Not a town or agricultural district which is not under the constant surveillance of the army; not a road in the remotest parts of the empire which is untraversed by the troops, or a gawky peasant who is permitted to forget that war any day may become the business of his life. Here William II, *imperator et rex*, is omnipotent. . . .

"The Socialists appeared in strength soon after the Empire was formed. 'We will give them all the Socialism they want,' said Bismarck, and the present Emperor has continued the policy. Rules and regulations cover the movements of the individual from the cradle to the grave in every relationship of life. Great bureaus have been established to govern, cajole, protect and sustain the population.

"Hundreds of thousands of men, organized with almost soldierly order, stand under noble personages, named by the Kaiser and the princes around him, to the great all-comprehending civil service. If there were 'free institutions' anywhere in this German land they would sink under the weight of the universal military organization and the bureaucracy created by State Socialism.

"Can it be supposed that this great system will soon be changed? Can we conceive of the people rising up to change it? Is there desire to sweep it away? I have never heard a German

outside of the ranks of militant Socialism express a wish for anything better than what he has. The typical old-line Prussian, who thanks God that he is not as other men, has become the typical German. He would have more seaports, more colonies and the like of that, but as for being rid of compulsory military service, or a king, or a bureaucratic system it is not much on his mind. 'Your America is corrupt,' he will tell you. 'Of course, you do not have an army. Yours is a new country, without enemies. Democracy has failed wherever it has been tried.'

"This is heard with more or less patience. What is depressing is to see the entire vaunted university system arrayed on the side of the Prussianized military Germany. There was a day in 1837, when seven men—Gervinus, Dahlmann, the two brothers Grimm among the number—walked out of Göttingen for their political opinions; another day, in 1848, when Professor Kinkel, at Bonn, shouldered a musket, led his students out to fight for republican institutions, and rotted in a prison at Spandau, until one of those students, young Carl Schurz, by bribing a keeper, lowered the poet and sage on a rope and hurried him in the night to a schooner at Rostock, by which means they together escaped to England.

"But the boldest man in our day has been Von Seydel at Munich, the Calhoun of Germany, who contended that the Empire under the Constitution is a Staatenbund instead of a Bundesstaat, and that Bavaria can secede from the Union, in the manner of South Carolina, whenever she has a mind to do so. About all of this nobody cares a rap. He would not have carried a gun to make so much come to pass. Every country university professor has before his eyes the blandishments of a well-rewarded post in Berlin, and this keeps him soundly Hohenzollern in his sympathies. Treitschke, Wagner and Dambach were, in my day as a student at Berlin, the types of men representing German scholarship in the political and economic sciences. They were Bismarck's own body servants.

"There is a great potential rumbling of unrest, but it has remained as pointless as it is strong, because of the rigor of the political system and a military domination of the people of a character never before seen in any country under the sun. There have been the loudest demands in recent years in Prussia for direct equal manhood suffrage. The demonstrations have

been as violent as the laws will allow. Some Social Democrats have found their way into the Landtag, in spite of the seemingly impossible obstacles to be overcome, in expression of the popular dissatisfaction, but the Government has yielded not one jot or tittle to the spirit of democratic progress.

"In 1890, at the end of the Bismarck regime, the Social Democrats polled 1,427,298 votes (nearly 20 out of 100) and they elected 35 members of the Reichstag. Such advancement has there been that in 1907 they held 53 seats, and five years later, in 1912, 110, a total since somewhat increased in bye-elections. Out of more than 12,000,000 voters a third, or over 4,000,000, were Social Democrats. The Radicals polled 1,500,000 votes and the National Liberals 1,600,000, a total for the left, or opposition parties, of approximately 7,500,000, for which by a just apportionment, they would have 260 instead of less than 200 seats in a house of 397 members.

"This Social Democratic uprising means something, but the Government is so amazingly constituted that the party is without any power to influence public policy. And now the Kaiser and his military men raise a cry of invasion from Russia, rekindle the fires of hate for England and France and these Socialists (with few exceptions) throw off their hats and go off to war behind the Prussian 'vons' and 'zus,' who direct the greatest military autocracy which mankind has ever seen.

"Revolution in Germany, of which a good deal is said, is probably as far distant as ever; though possibly the way may be prepared for changes if the Allies shall win in this war. One of the most important works on the subject of government is President A. Lawrence Lowell's "Governments and Parties in Continental Europe." He is of the opinion that there is no real wish for popular government in Germany, unless it be in the South, where the principles of the French Revolution made themselves felt in the 18th century, and no genius to institute it, conduct it and enjoy it. Just this lesson did the young liberal enthusiast, Carl Schurz, learn in 1848. 'The people,' says he in his *Reminiscences*, 'although highly developed in science, philosophy, literature and art, had always lived under a severe guardianship in all political matters. They had never been out of leading strings. They had never received or known the teachings which spring from the feeling of responsibility in free political action. The affairs of Government lay outside

of the customs and habits of their lives.' (Reminiscences, volume I, page 124.) May not these judgments apply just as truly to the Germans of this present day?

"It may be a fact, as another respectable writer has said, that they are discontented because they have 'outgrown their institutions'; that the aim of a great body of them is 'unfettered representative government.' I, for one, basing my opinion on observations during a long residence in their midst, cannot think that they have very much less political liberty than they deserve, or are fitted to exercise. That people which needs what is better usually finds the way to attain it. The proof or disproof of our theories may be at hand, possibly, in the course of, or at the end of this great present war. . . .

"These then are the 'free institutions' of Prussia and of all Germany. They belong to that period in England which preceded the Revolution of 1688, that period in France preceding the fall of the Bastille. The German would fain believe that in these few past months he has extended the sphere of his influence into Belgium and a portion of France. He had before proven his character as a ruler of captured lands in the unhappy provinces of Alsace and Lorraine. England and the rest of the world will fairly conclude that it is his design to impose these sentiments and systems upon other parts of the earth's surface, if he shall be the victor in this war. The German frau will throw up her hands several times in a day and exclaim, 'Gott bewahre!' It is 'Gott bewahre' now for the non-Prussian world and the great cause of popular government. Shall democracy live on this planet, after two or three centuries of growth and development, or shall it be written by the historian of the future that in the first years of the twentieth century it went down before kaisers and princes and prætors, directing obedient legions armed to the teeth?"

With this convincing and enlightening testimony as to the real principles represented by Germany in this war, and this final reply to Doctor Dernburg's false description of Germany's "democracy" and of her ballot-law, "more liberal than the one in use in the United States," I must close this chapter. I wish I could get every intelligent

German-American in this country to read it, not, of course, for what I have written, but for what I have quoted. I think many of them, whatever their views as to the relative merits of the two systems of government, would find, as I do, something humorous in calling "democratic" a system under which civilians could be arrested by an army officer for "intending to laugh." And yet that occurred as recently as December, 1913, and was proved at the trial resulting from the shameful, and now historic, Zabern occurrence, when, with other outrages, a helpless cripple was stabbed in the back. The Court, acting in this "democracy," acquitted the colonel in command "because he did not know that he had acted illegally." (66)

CHAPTER VIII.

In Addition to the Evidence Already Presented as to the Mental Attitude of the Average German Toward His Own Race and Toward Other European Races, Are There Any Facts Tending to Show His Real Attitude Toward America?

If in answering this I begin by coming back again to Bernhardi and Treitschke, it is because I believe it has been shown that, in spite of eleventh-hour denials, they truly represent the Germany of 1914—the Germany of this war. How much of the mistaken “devotion” of the German nation at this time is due to their teachings and to those of their class it is impossible to state dogmatically. But that they have greatly influenced their compatriots there can be no doubt.

Let us see what these “Pan Germanists” have to say to their fellow-countrymen about America. Bernhardi says (67) that in our efforts at The Hague Congresses and, more recently in our attempts to conclude treaties for the establishment of Arbitration Courts, we have not pacific ideals as the real motive of our actions, but “usually employ the need of peace as a cloak under which to promote” our own political aims. He goes on :

“We can hardly assume that a real love of peace prompts these efforts. This is shown by the fact that precisely those Powers which, as the weaker, are exposed to aggression, and therefore were in the greatest need of international protection, have been completely passed over in the American proposals for Arbitration Courts. It must consequently be assumed that very matter-of-fact political motives led the Americans, with

their commercial instincts, to take such steps, and induced perfidious Albion to accede to the proposals. We may suppose that England intended to protect her rear in event of a war with Germany, but that America wished to have a free hand in order to follow her policy of sovereignty in Central America without hindrance, and to carry out her plans regarding the Panama Canal in the exclusive interests of America. Both countries certainly entertained the hope of gaining advantage over the other signatory of the treaty, and of winning the lion's share for themselves. Theorists and fanatics imagine that they see in the efforts of President Taft a great step forward on the path to perpetual peace, and enthusiastically agree with him. Even the Minister for Foreign Affairs in England, with well-affected idealism, termed the procedure of the United States an era in the history of mankind." . . .

"The United States of America, *e. g.*, in June, 1911, championed the ideas of universal peace in order to be able to devote their undisturbed attention to money-making and the enjoyment of wealth, and to save the three hundred million dollars which they spend on their army and navy." . . .

"In America, Elihu Root, formerly Secretary of State, declared in 1908 that the High Court of International Justice established by the second Hague Conference would be able to pronounce definite and binding decisions by virtue of the pressure brought to bear by public opinion. The present leaders of the American peace movement seem to share this idea. With a childlike self-consciousness, they appear to believe that public opinion must represent the view which the American plutocrats think most profitable to themselves." . . .

"While, on the one side, she [America] insists on the Monroe Doctrine, on the other she stretches out her own arms towards Asia and Africa, in order to find bases for her fleets. The United States aims at the economic and, where possible, the political command of the American continent, and at naval supremacy in the Pacific."

So much for Bernhardi.

Treitschke says: (68)

"To civilization at large, the Anglicising of the German-Americans means a heavy loss. . . . Among Germans there can no longer be any question that the civilization of mankind (*Gesittung der Menschheit*) suffers every time a German is transformed into a Yankee."

Delbrück says: (69)

"It seems extremely questionable that, under the prevailing loose political conditions and extraordinarily easy changes from one party to another, the United States should be in a position to attain to a permanent military status at all. Their momentary proud position need deceive no one. The Americans have not yet stood any really severe test."

No wonder that the Ridders and Münsterbergs and Hilprechts and Jastrows seek to belittle Bernhardt and Treitschke and their teachings as a preliminary to the conciliation of America. But I fear that the transformation of the representative of "Kultur" into the despised Yankee takes place much less frequently than we had supposed.

The reason it does not occur oftener is not far to seek, if one recognizes that our German-Americans are still under the influence of the "Fatherland."

There can be no doubt that German and American political ideals are absolutely divergent. They have already come into conflict over South America, the Panama Canal and the Philippines. Calwer, a German socialist, says that preliminary to a socialistic economic organization of the world, "Capitalism must first bring the world under subjection," and adds:

"It follows that capital—including German capital as well—must first go forth and subdue the world with the means and weapons which are at its disposal," i. e., with fire and sword.

The same sort of thing crops out wherever their bureaucrats write. Herr Schlettwein, a Government Colonist and an expert on colonial matters, when asked to instruct the Reichstag on the principles of colonization, said:

"In colonial politics we stand at the parting of the ways—on the one side healthy egoism . . . on the other exaggerated humanitarianism. The Herreros must be compelled to work, and to work without compensation, and in return for their food only. Forced labor for years is only a just punishment, and at the same time it is the best method of training them."

How long would an American governmental employé remain in public life after expressing that sentiment to Congress?

The German ideal is far remote from American ideals. Mr. E. S. Martin says: (70)

"It is good in Krupps and chemistry, in manufacture, in trade, in civic government, in the regulation of life for the promotion of average comfort. It is bad in art. It is not notable in the higher forms of literature. And as to the great point of making nobler types of men—has it done it? The Germans are notably efficient, but are they creative? are they inventive? and are they nobler than other men? They have told us that democratic France was decadent; that democratic England was a pretense and an empty shell; that Russia was barbarous. They said nothing about Belgium. There ought to be a Nobel prize for nobility. If there were, would it go to Germany? One sees in Germany immense efficiency, courage, aggressiveness, capacity to suffer, but where, so far, has she been noble? In Belgium? At Louvain? At Rheims?

"Her specialty is fighting, but man for man she can't handle the Belgians or the new French, and her superiority to the Russians is dubious, while as for the English, they are but a handful so far in this war, but it has been a handful for Germany.

"No; get them out of their shops and laboratories and the

current Germans don't seem to be of an egregious nobility. The Belgians can give them odds in it, and they seem to have nothing on the lately decadent French. They must be learning a wonderful lot about the qualities of other people, and perhaps they are revising their self-esteem."

They learn slowly. Months of war and the all but universal condemnation of the civilized world have not shaken their confidence in their governmental methods, nor their admiration for themselves. In December Dr. Franz Junge wrote: (71)

"But it is a reflection upon the intelligence of trained observers, native as well as foreign, to speak seriously of the effectiveness of popular government in practice. Nor is it consistent with the rule of reason, which governs the destinies of the United States, to introduce moral considerations of abstract justice into the settling of international disputes, with which the waging of war has never had anything to do. . . .

"Now, if the absence of adequate rule in America offers so feeble a guarantee against the complete reversal of the fundamental principles of government—from individualism to collectivism, and from democracy to plutocracy—not to speak of corruption in its various forms; if the enlightened people of America, working as they do under the most favorable auspices of heredity and environment, with all their political liberties, have been unable to preserve their economic independence, how can it be surprising that the German people hesitate to commit their country to the same policy of *laissez faire*? . . .

"Why, after all, should the German people abandon their political system, which has proved successful to the Commonwealth, and adopt American institutions, which are notorious for the contrast or discrepancy between recognized political principles and actual political life?"

And (*Ibid*) Dr. Ervin Acel continues:

"I have kept myself from a discussion of the ethical questions involved in the stand taken by America. Germany did right

or did wrong; it does not matter which. But, however that may be, the very interests of the United States require a victorious Germany and a humbled Japan and England. *Therefore the American policy is a mistake, in view of the future, and a blunder in policy is more unpardonable than crime.*

"As to Europe, every century has its caryatid which carries the weight of its culture. There was a time when the world's culture found its highest expression among the Greeks, among the Romans, among the French. Now we see this high-water mark of learning among the Germans. Her philosophers, engineers, scholars, merchants, all '*marche en la tête de la civilisation*': they lead the army of civilization."

Such colossal conceit would be unworthy even of ridicule were it not that both articles unintentionally, and therefore the more significantly, betray a conception of international morals which, if carried into effect in personal activities, would disqualify both writers for ordinary dealings with their fellow citizens, at least in this country.

The Outlook deals with the matter editorially as follows:

"A passage from each of these two articles will suffice to indicate to our readers how marked is the difference between their point of view and the point of view of *The Outlook*. . . . *The Outlook* believes that it *does* matter a great deal whether a country does right or does wrong, and that it is in accord with the rule of reason to introduce moral considerations into the settling of international disputes."

An article in a recent number of a magazine of high standing (72), should be called to the attention of Americans. There are many living who could prove or disprove its statements, for which, especially as it is signed by a *nom-de-plume*, I can assume no responsibility. They are, however, so in accord with much of the recent German and German-American behavior that they seem more credible

to-day than ever before. The article begins with the assertion that:

"Germany has consistently followed a twofold policy toward the United States. Always reckoning with the possibility of a collision with England, she has endeavoured to be on good terms with the United States, counting upon their support in case of a great war. At the same time, German statesmen have seen in the Great Republic an economic and political danger and, while ostensibly maintaining excellent relations with the United States, they have stealthily endeavoured to weaken them by various ways, and especially by creating enmity between them and England. In leading German circles it has been an article of faith that the United States and England are natural enemies; that both countries bitterly remember the War of Independence and the quarrels which succeeded it. It has been an article of faith in Germany that Canada was coveted by all Americans; that the existence of that great English Dominion in North America was an ever-present cause of friction between the two Anglo-Saxon States; that the Americans would take Canada as soon as England was involved in a really serious war."

It continues by citing Prince Bismarck's views as to the Monroe Doctrine, views which there is much reason to believe are those of official Germany to-day. They appeared in the *Hamburger Nachrichten* on February 9, 1896:

"Some German newspapers continue discussing the so-called 'Monroe Doctrine,' in consequence of the events which have taken place in South America. We are of opinion that that doctrine, and the way in which it is now advanced by the American Republic, is an incredible impertinence (*eine unglaubliche Unverschämtheit*) towards the rest of the world. The Monroe Doctrine is merely an act of violence, based upon great strength, towards all American States and towards those European States which possess interests in America."

The author reviews the Samoan incident, and says of the Manila Bay controversy:

"During the Spanish-American War Germany endeavoured to acquire the Philippines. While other countries had sent only a few ships to the Philippine Islands, Germany had, without any obvious reason, despatched there her Pacific Squadron—a force equal to that commanded by Admiral Dewey. The German Admiral Diedrichs endeavoured to foil Admiral Dewey's operations, and the relations between the German and American fleets became so strained that a battle between the two was avoided only by the intervention of the English Commander, who backed up his American colleague." (p. 180)

He continues:

"In 1907, Mr. Emil Witte, a former Press *attaché* at the German Embassy in Washington, published at Leipzig a book on his experiences at the Washington Embassy. For some reason or other, that book, which contains disclosures most damaging to the German Government, has remained practically unknown. It is so scarce a book that it seems possible that the German Government bought up and destroyed all the copies it could lay hands on.

The following extracts from Mr. Witte's disclosures throw a powerful light upon Germany's diplomatic methods, and upon her American policy. Mr. Witte was, in spring 1898, one of the editors of the *Deutsche Zeitung* of Vienna. At that time the Spanish-American War broke out, and practically the whole of the German and Austrian Press took the part of Spain and violently attacked the United States in accordance with official directions." (See pp. 216-17-18)

He follows with a number of extracts from Mr. Witte's book, "Experiences at a German Embassy: Ten Years of German-American Diplomacy," by Emil Witte, late Councillor of Legation, Leipzig, 1907:

"The public learns from these pages for the first time the truth, and the whole truth, about German-American relations, the true state of which has been disguised and misrepresented on both sides of the ocean by a powerful and corrupt Press. . . ."

"These Americans are, after all, incredibly simple. They swallow any bait greedily as long as it is sufficiently sugared and placed before them with a friendly smile.' I heard this phrase frequently from an intimate friend of Herr von Holleben, the German Ambassador at Washington, at the time when I had the honour to be attached to the German Embassy at Washington in order to attend to Press matters. That phrase is characteristic of the view which prevailed among German diplomats towards the statesmen of the New World. These views have led to very gross errors. After a number of serious incidents, such as the Dewey-Diedrichs episode in the Bay of Manila, the unfortunate Samoa affair, the Coghlan affair, and the Venezuela imbroglio, the diplomats at Berlin suddenly remembered the old historic friendship which united Prussia and the United States since the time of Frederick the Great, and they assured the Americans that the great Republic possessed no more faithful and sincere friend than the German Emperor. In order to give a practical demonstration of that historical friendship to the world in general and to the United States in particular, the American journey of Prince Henry was announced. . . ."

"The Prince arrived, and he convinced himself and was able to report to his Imperial brother that he was in a country where one-third of the population was of German birth or of German descent, and was firmly resolved to stand faithfully at Germany's side under all circumstances. He convinced himself of the truth of the statement, which Dr. von Holleben had made to a journalist at a time when German-American relations were in a critical state, that a war between Germany and the United States would assume the character of a *civil war*." . . .

"Dr. A. von Mumm admitted to me at Washington that Germany was responsible for the unhappy Dewey-Diedrichs incident at Manila." . . .

"The anti-German attitude of the American Press which was noticeable at the time when I entered upon my duties (January, 1899) was not unjustified. I was selected as Press *attaché* to the German Embassy in America, to make up for the sins which the German Press had committed in its blind desire to please the men at the Wilhelmstrasse." . . .

"When I entered upon my duties, I received the general instruction to do everything in my power to silence the journals hostile to Germany, and to convert them from determined enemies of Germany into friends and admirers of the Emperor. Besides, it was my duty to create the belief in American public opinion that the true enemy of the United States was not Germany, but England. . . . Thus I began my work."

Further extracts are of great interest at this moment to every American who is striving intelligently to reach a fair conclusion as to the genuine German attitude toward our country.

"The German-American Ambassador played a very delicate and dangerous part in the German-American movement. Mr. John J. Lentz, of Columbus, Ohio, a member of Congress, told me: 'Please tell the Ambassador to keep the German-American movement *progressing with energy*.' The Ambassador replied, when I gave him the message, that 'it was not unexpected.' I had met Mr. Lentz previously in the house of Herr von Sternburg, and I met him frequently at the Embassy. As he was a member of the Committee for Military Affairs, and was therefore acquainted with the most secret information, his intercourse with us was not approved of by American people." . . .

"The vast majority of the German newspapers appearing in the United States could not conveniently exist if they did not save the wages of journalists and compositors by relying upon the factories which produce stereotyped matter. The producers of the stereotyped matter which is sent out to the German-American papers can make a living only by copying matter which has appeared in the German and Austrian journals and periodicals. They reprint part of their contents, cast plates, and sell these at a very low price to the German-American Press. The *New Yorker Staats Zeitung* asserts that

it is the only German newspaper in America which pays its contributors for belletristical contributions, but its payments are more than modest. The very difficult struggle for existence forces the German-American newspapers to play a very humiliating part." . . .

"Without doubting for a moment the often-asserted loyalty to the United States expressed by the members of the German Soldiers' Societies in the United States, and without dwelling on the reasons why they have been officially distinguished by the German Government by sending them flags, decorations, gracious letters, etc., it must be frankly stated that *the relations between official Germany and the emigrant subjects of the Emperor, whether they have become citizens of the Republic or not, may lead to serious complications between Germany and the United States, and to unforeseen difficulties which at any moment may involve both Powers.*" . . .

"In handing over the first colours bestowed on behalf of the Emperor William II, to the Military Society of Chicago, the German Ambassador, Dr. von Holleben, said: 'Greetings from the German Emperor! That is the cry with which I come before you. His Majesty, my most gracious master, has ordered me to hand to you to-day the colour which has been desired by you so strongly and for so long. The colour is a token of His Majesty's graciousness and of the approval with which the German Emperor remembers in love and friendship those who have served in the German army and navy, and those who have fought and bled for the Fatherland. This colour is to be the symbol of German faithfulness, German manliness, and German military honour. His Majesty asks you to accept the colour as a token of that unity which should prevail among all German soldiers, to act also abroad in accordance with the sentiments of German loyalty and German sense of duty, and to take for your maxim the word of that great German, Bismarck: 'We Germans fear God, but nothing else in the world!' Now let the colour flutter in the wind. In this moment of enthusiasm, let us all sound the cry that is now on the lips of every old German soldier: 'His Majesty, German Emperor, William II, Hurrah! Hurrah! Hurrah!'

"The wooing of the formerly despised German renegades in the United States by the German Empire, and its official representatives in America, since the Spanish-American War, must

seem all the stranger to the spectators, and especially to Anglo-Americans, as that policy is directly opposed to the policy which the German Government pursues in Germany towards men of non-German language. What would happen if the King of Denmark, or the President of the French Republic, should send to the former's citizens of Denmark in Schleswig-Holstein, and of France in Alsace-Lorraine through their official representatives, colours with inciting inscriptions, or if Danes or Frenchmen dwelling in Germany, and remembering regretfully the old *regime*, should send across the German frontier telegrams assuring their former rulers of their undying faithfulness and loyalty? What would happen if the Poles living in Berlin should march in procession through the streets carrying national banners and the portraits of their national heroes, singing Polish national songs? In America dwell also Danes, Frenchmen, and Poles, who are good citizens of the Republic, who thirst for vengeance against the German Empire, and who do not fail at every opportunity to point out how strangely Germany's policy in America contrasts with Germany's policy in Germany.

"One cannot be surprised if the Government at Washington is becoming somewhat nervous and believes that possibly there is a German league which, in the event of a war between Germany and the United States, would aim at creating an independent federation of the largely German States of the Middle West of America, involving the United States in a Civil War. Herr von Holleben has pointed out that possibility by telling a lady interviewer, Mrs. Grace A. Downing, laying stress upon his words, that a war between the United States and Germany would bear the character of a *Civil War*."

I repeat that, so far as actual facts are concerned, I can neither corroborate nor disprove the statements of Herr Witte.

It is interesting, however, in explanation of the present efficiency of the German-American "News Bureau" here, to note the years of experience they must have had, according to Herr Witte, in supplying "the vast majority of Ger-

man newspapers appearing in the United States with 'stereotyped matter.'” (See pp. 193-94.)

For fuller evidence as to the relations between Germany and America see Chapters IX and X.

Curiously enough, the fundamental idea of our American republic, the idea for which the War of the Revolution was fought, the idea for the preservation of which to-day Americans would unhesitatingly lay down their lives, is known to political philosophers and historians as “the Teutonic idea.”

It is the irreconcilable conflict between that idea and the mediæval ideas of a people willing to be governed by a Hohenzollern that prevents the more frequent metamorphosis of a German into a “Yankee.”

Professor McElroy has shown (73) that the “Teutonic idea”—the idea of representative government—dating back to the earliest days of European history, gradually overwhelmed on the Continent by the Roman idea (of government from above), except in the highlands of Switzerland and the lowlands of Holland, survived in the British Isles. It was kept alive at Runnymede, and by Simon de Montfort's parliament and against it, he says, “The despotic Tudors, the treacherous Stuarts and the dull Hanoverians struggled in vain.”

It thrived in the American Colonies, and the American Revolution started it upon a new and glorious career. Almost at once the representative idea was restored in England, and in France emerged, “after centuries of complete obliteration, in a revolutionary movement that shook Europe from end to end.”

Professor McElroy continues:

“It has since spread rapidly. Wherever the British flag has appeared the ‘Teutonic idea’ has been planted and its roots care-

fully nourished. It is a plant of slow growth; but it is worth the trouble of careful cultivation. No man can deny the fact that, with all the faults of administration, and they are many and grave, often written in letters of blood, the flag of England and that of her own flesh and blood, the United States, have been followed always by the idea and practice of representative government. We may criticise the Boer War; but we know that as soon as the Boers were subdued they were told to govern themselves. Men may question the propriety of American intervention in Cuba; but no one can deny that we voluntarily stood aside, after gaining full possession of the island, and invited her people to select representatives and manage their own affairs. In the elaboration of this idea one need not argue; one need only invite attention to the facts which are patent to all men. Whatever we may think of England, therefore, we know that the great Germanic idea of government 'of the people, by the people, and for the people' follows her flag.

"But what of Germany under the hegemony of Prussia? Prussia has been throughout her history, as her greatest publicist, Professor Hans Delbrück, has phrased it, a *Kriegsstaat*. Her history is a military history. In reading it we miss the story of the glorious conflicts for the people's right to a share in the government. There are no Runnymede barons, no Simon de Montforts, no Oliver Cromwells, no Abraham Lincolns, in the history of Prussia. Slowly, but with a grim and terrible certainty, the iron hand of the Prussian War Lord has brought the German nation to exactly the position to which King George III attempted to bring England and the American Colonies. In Germany the Teutonic idea is dead. A mixed race, more Slavonic than Teutonic, the Prussian, has deprived the German people of their birthright. There, as Professor Cramb strikingly phrases it, 'Corsica . . . has conquered Galilee.' The ideals of Prussia remain to-day just what they were in the days of the Great Elector—ideals of absolute monarchy—and the German Empire has accepted them. 'The German people,' wrote Charles Sarolea in 1912, 'are governed more completely from Berlin, and Potsdam than the French were governed from Paris and Versailles. In theory, every part of the Empire may have a proportional share in the administration of the country; in reality, Prussia has the ultimate political and financial control.' And it is to maintain and extend this

half-Slavonic military despotism calling its war chief the 'anointed of the Lord' that the Germans are giving their lives."

"The *furor Teutonicus* of which we have had warning from Professor Richard has all its cylinders in action. 'The Germans,' said Dr. Richard, in the *Outlook*, 'are determined to win at any cost, and after their victory to leave their enemies in such shape that they will never be able to disturb the peace again.' That expresses the underlying purpose of this war—the annihilation of all obstacles to Germany's supremacy in Europe." (74)

For still further citations illustrating the real feeling of Germany to-day, and her genuine attitude toward America in times past I would ask the reader to turn to pp. 216-19 to learn their views in 1898 when we were at war ourselves, and to p. 242 to acquaint himself with their sentiments toward us now that we are neutral. A summary of some of their current journalistic expressions will also be found on p. 421.

CHAPTER IX.

What is the Attitude of German-Americans Toward This War and Toward the Principles Involved?

This has been and is one of the great surprises of the war to most Americans. It is unnecessary to say that we value our German-American citizens, and thought that in times of stress in the future, as in the past, they would demonstrate that they were as democratic and as truly American as any of us. It was quite common to hear the expression from Americans that this was a "Prussian war," a "Kaiser's war," "a War Lord's fight," and that the "German people" had our sympathies, though we hoped Germany would lose. In Mr. Fraley's brochure, already quoted from, he says eloquently:

"Oh, Great People of South and Middle Germany; brave, kindly, lovers of the peaceful arts, lovers of liberty; you, who as you march, are singing of homes in Schwabenland and Bayernland, and where the grape blooms on the Rhine; how long will you sacrifice not only your blood and treasure, but your sacred honor, to uphold this spirit of inexorable militarism, foisted upon you under the pretense that through it your dear Fatherland may be at rest, but whose real purpose is that a Prussian shall write himself *Imperator et Rex?*"

If we thought this of portions of the German nation itself, it may be understood how much more confident we were as to the sentiments of the Germans who had become part of our own family. But we were soon to be undeceived.

At the present moment the American people might with

some show of accuracy be divided into Americans and a subdivision of what the newspapers call "Hyphenated-Americans."

This subdivision seems to consist chiefly, if not entirely, of a certain number of Teutonic accessions to our citizenship—*i. e.*, of "German-Americans." What numerical relation it has to the whole body of useful and valued American citizens of German birth or ancestry it is just now impossible to determine. The classification I suggest would rest upon three chief characteristics: 1. A pronounced tendency to unfriendly or contemptuous criticism of the United States. 2. Undiscriminating sympathy with and support of the actions of Germany before and during the present war. 3. An effort to arouse anti-British prejudice among Americans.

The so-called German-Americans who do not belong in the group thus defined may be in the large majority. I hope they are. But thus far they have scarcely been heard from, while the others are almost daily appealing to Americans for intellectual and moral aid and countenance. That their appeals are often tactless, frequently untruthful, and sometimes insulting, is an interesting phenomenon which is deserving of study.

In a biological investigation certain factors would be at once considered if the cause of a particular racial or tribal peculiarity were being sought for. Chief among these factors would be heredity and environment, the latter including the customary diet with the sources of food supply. This would be true whether the peculiarity were physical or psychical—*i. e.*, whether it was, for example, a matter of stature and complexion or a matter of belief and religious observance. Similarly, the food that may have helped to produce it would be of interest to the investigator, whether it were for the body or for the mind—*e. g.*,

whether clay-eating causing the swollen belly of the Digger, or Chauvinistic literature causing—to use the vernacular—the swollen head of the “world power or perish” German.

Viewed from this standpoint the phenomenon in question seems to admit of easy explanation. The influence of heredity is, of course, obvious and unmistakable. Thus far the overwhelming majority of the apologists—little or big—for Germany in this country are of German birth or descent. It is rare to find an American name prefixed or appended to an article or communication calling for the sympathy of Americans for Germany in this crisis, or asking them to “suspend judgment,” or appealing for “fairness and moderation,” or extolling the bravery, the self-sacrifice and the high moral purposes of the Germans; or even narrating the extreme consideration shown them in Germany after the outbreak of the war.

Coupled with their articles is not uncommonly abuse of American methods, attempts to show that we have ourselves been guilty of crimes no less abhorrent than those with which Germany is charged, assertions that our indignation is hypocrisy and that the overwhelming anti-German sentiment of the country is due to lying newspapers influencing a hysterical populace.

One “German-American” journalistic “conciliator” who seems to be especially charged with the duty of combating and modifying the prevailing deep and spontaneous sympathy for the Allies actually attributes the public expressions of this sympathy to our hypocrisy and untruthfulness.

This would be inexplicable if it were not for certain facts that throw upon it an illuminating sidelight.

We have already seen the attitude of many German writers toward this country. It is obvious that they have been supplying not only to Germans, but also to German-Americans, the mental pabulum which has nourished in

the latter the combined sentiment of worship of militarism and dislike for the ideals of the country of their adoption. This seems extravagant, and it is certainly surprising that such a statement could have even a slight basis of truth. But listen to Münsterberg: (75) "In the German view the State is not for the individuals, but the individuals for the State."

And again:

"Those men who have achieved the marvelous progress of German civilization have done it in the conviction that the military spirit is a splendid training for cultural efficiency. The university professors have always been the most enthusiastic defenders of the system. . . .

"Germany is not understood by those who fancy that defeat would tear an abyss between the people and the Emperor. There is not room in Germany for a president. The idea of a president is that he draws his power from the will of the millions of individuals. The idea of the emperor is that he is the symbol of the State as a whole, independent from the will of the individuals, and therefore independent of any elections. In the symbol of the crown, far above the struggles of partisan individuals, lies the idea of the German nation."

Professor Kuno Francke said in a recent speech:

"To the German the State is a spiritual, collective personality leading a life of its own beyond the lives of individuals, and its aim is not the protection of the happiness of individuals, but the making of a nobler type of man and the achievement of high excellence in all the departments of life." This is the Kaiser's ideal, too, and his glorification of his office "makes him the incarnation of the active and disciplined Germany."

Upon this statement E. S. Martin comments as follows:
(76)

"We are all trying hard just now to understand the Germans,

and these words of Dr. Francke are adapted to help us. Just now this German ideal has to be taken in association with about five million highly competent soldiers, all practicing to spread it, and a large supply of exceptionally efficient Krupp guns exploding to the same end. The association is a little trying to the ideal. Is that a mere misfortune, or do the army and the ideal belong together? Is this German ideal necessarily tied up to militarism because it is necessarily hostile to the ideal of individual freedom that belongs to such nations as France, England, Belgium, and the United States? Nobody outside of Germany would object, it would seem, to Dr. Francke's German ideal unless there is something in it that threatens the security of other nations."

Here are some more quotations from "German-Americans": (77)

"The overwhelming majority of the Germans give their heartiest support to their far-seeing and wise monarch."

"Modern Germany, with all her great achievements, is inseparable from the Germany of military discipline, and would never have come into existence without the support of a strong, steadfast and determined government. The 'two Germanys' must stand or fall together, for the German people and their Kaiser are one!"

"The German people are as inseparable from their Kaiser as we in America are from our Constitution."

"The whole German people are practically unanimous in the opinion that the monarchical form of government, with great authority and strongly centralized, is the best for them. Even the great Social Democratic party is organized upon this principle, and does not in the least resemble a Democratic party in the American sense of the word."

The *Kölnische Zeitung* (78) publishes a letter from a German—or German-American—resident in this country, as to the events immediately following the outbreak of the war:

"These were glorious days! . . . A holy wrath breaks over us, the *furor teutonicus*. All Germany flames up like a powder-mine. . . . Who is not for us is against us. And they were all, all against us, America the most furious. Search history as you will, you will not find a page that records the like of what appears in these days in the American press. They write with Indian arrowheads and for ink use viper's venom. Has ever one member of the family of nations ventured to employ against another such a mode of speech, especially when that other was locked in a most sanguinary strife?

"And America is a neutral State! . . . Americans, with left-handed meaning, speak of the Kaiser as 'the War Lord.' And for the honest Yankee there is no more ghastly title than this. For it sounds better to play the peace waltz! On all the editorial organs they play now only one melody: Germany is the world's champion peace-buster (*Allerweltsstörenfried*), and when peace is broken the freedom of the people is beaten into fragments. . . . A land, a people, a nation, is the prey of the American vultures of the press. For these conveyors of culture there is no such thing as honor of country, people, or nation."

"The *Kölnische Zeitung* also prints an article by a Dr. Charles Hexamer, of Philadelphia, who tells his readers that he is not proud of America. He accuses the United States of praying on Sundays for peace and supplying England and its Allies with war materials on other days of the week. This, he exclaims, is hypocrisy and would be more consistent were America to relinquish her Star Spangled Banner and proud motto, 'E Pluribus Unum,' and supply herself with a flag inscribed: 'The dollar, no matter how you get it, so long as you get it.'"
(79)

Further quotations illustrating this subject will be found in Chapter X.

Price Collier throws some light on the matter as regards the German *Germans* when he says: (80)

"In order to build up his patriotism the German has been taught systematically to dislike the Austrians, then the French,

now the English, and let not the American suppose that he likes the American any better, for he does not."

Pére Didon also helps when he writes: (81)

"J'ai essayé maintes fois de découvrir chez l'allemand une sympathie quelconque pour d'autres nations; je n'y ai réussi."

But the most illuminating comment is made in another portion of Collier's book, where he sums up his views as to the entire Germanic system:

"There is no such thing in Germany as democratic or representative government.

"The orderliness of the Germans is all forced upon them from without, and is not due to their own knowledge of how to take care of themselves.

"German State socialism is, in a nutshell, the decision on the part of the rulers that the individual is not competent to spend his own money, choose his own calling, use his own time as he will or provide for his own future or the various emergencies of life. By minute State control they are rapidly bringing the whole population to an enfeebled social and political condition, where they can do nothing for themselves. . . . There are 3,000,000 officials, great and small, in Germany, and 14,000,000 electors, or, roughly, one policeman to every five adults.

"I have said that the population is well fed, well clothed and well looked after. Of course they are. No slave owner so maltreats his slaves that they cannot work for him. But is man fed by bread alone?

. . . "The electors, now so flattered by the smooth phrases of their tyrants disguised as liberators, will one day be aghast to find themselves in a veritable house of correction paid for from their own savings.

"The very barrenness of the soil, the ring of enemies, the soft moral and social texture of the population, have, so their little knot of rulers think, made necessary these harsh, artificial forcing methods. The outstanding proof of the artificiality of this civilization is its powerlessness to propagate. Germans transplanted from their hothouse civilization to other countries

cease to be Germans; and nowhere in the world outside Germany is German civilization imitated, liked or adopted.

"Autocracy, bureaucracy and militarism are triplets of straw, not destined to live. They are precocious children, teaching the pallid religion of dependence upon the State and enforcing the anarchical morality of man's despair of himself.

"Germany has organized herself into an organization, and is the most overgoverned country in the world. Life is to live, not to think, after all. This is where the metaphysician invariably fails when he mistakes thinking for living, when he mistakes organization, which can never be more than a mold for life, for life itself.

"Germany has shown us that the short cut to the government of a people by suppression and strangulation results in a dreary development of mediocrity. She has proved again that the only safety for either an individual or a nation is to be loved and respected; and in these days no one respects slavery or loves threats."

Another American writer, after making this quotation, adds: (82)

"Such is the true meaning of the system which has produced the modern Germany of machine-like efficiency, of a governmental philosophy founded upon force, of universal submission to undemocratic ideals. It is a picture to sadden all admirers of the race which has wrought such benefits to mankind.

"Yet this is the system which patriotic Germans in America insist is necessary. The fruits of German energy and genius, they say, are due not to racial capacity, but to the crushing out of individualism and the surrender of national liberty to the purpose of creating a glorified State.

"In plain terms, they declare the astonishing theory that the German people are incapable of progress under democratic institutions, but have become great in the mass only because they have subordinated the nation's will to an intelligent officialdom and ordered their lives to the commands of a militaristic discipline."

"The most startling among Bernhardi's doctrines are (1) the

denial that there are any duties owed by the State to humanity, except that of imposing its own superior civilization upon as large a part of humanity as possible, and (2) the denial of the duty of observing treaties. Treaties are only so much paper.

"To modern German writers the State is a much more tremendous entity than it is to Englishmen or Americans. It is a supreme power with a sort of mystic sanctity, a power conceived of, as it were, self-created; a force altogether distinct from, and superior to, the persons who compose it.

"Let us see how these doctrines affect the smaller and weaker States which have hitherto lived in comparative security beside the Great Powers.

"They will be absolutely at the mercy of the stronger. Even if protected by treaties guaranteeing their neutrality and independence, they will not be safe, for treaty obligations are worthless 'when they do not correspond to facts,' *i. e.*, when the strong Power finds that they stand in its way. Its interests are paramount.

"If a State has valuable minerals, as Sweden has iron, and Belgium coal, and Rumania oil; or if it has abundance of water, power, like Norway, Sweden, and Switzerland; or if it holds the mouth of a navigable river, the upper course of which belongs to another nation, the great State may conquer and annex the small State as soon as it finds that it needs the minerals, or the water-power, or the river mouth.

"It has the Power, and Power gives Right. The interests, the sentiments, the patriotism and love of independence of the small people go for nothing.

"Civilization has turned back upon itself. Culture is to expand itself by barbaric force. Governments derive their authority not from the consent of the governed, but from the weapons of the conqueror." (83)

Among the unenviable peculiarities our German-American citizens have developed is one already alluded to, a determined effort to arouse anti-British feeling by reference to all the occasions when there has been war or dispute between the two countries from the time of the Revolution down to the Venezuelan incident.

But this is as clumsy, as ineffective and, I think, as distasteful to most Americans as their equally uncouth attempts at flattery.

They forget that America has never been the home of "grudges"; that every important incident they cite, even the most recent, belongs to the period of generations that have passed away. They forget that the greatest war of the last century, between two sections of our own country, has been, so far as continued rancor and bitterness are concerned, as completely forgotten as if it had occurred in the time of the Crusades. They forget that the ideals of the English-speaking people the world over are at once the most democratic and the nearest to successful realization that the world has ever seen, and that our brothers in the French Republic have their faces steadfastly set toward the same goal.

They forget that our present differences are in essence trivial and superficial, while our likenesses are flesh of our flesh and bone of our bone.

They ignore the fact that the fairest and most penetrating analysis of our country, our methods and our people ever written was from the pen of a Briton, Viscount Bryce; and that the most sympathetic and impartial story of our War of Independence was told by an English historian, Sir George Trevelyan. They are stupid enough to forget the incident in Manila Bay in 1898, when the German Admiral Von Diedrichs, after a series of petty and provocative infractions of the blockade established by Admiral Dewey, approached Captain Chichester, in command of the British fleet, to learn what he would do if further disregard of Dewey's orders were shown. But the American people have not forgotten Captain Chichester's reply to the effect that he "would do whatever Dewey wanted him to do."

Nor have they forgotten that at that very time Germany was endeavoring to bring about an "understanding" among European Powers that would result in interference on behalf of Spain.

Our German-American quarrel makers do not know doubtless, but many of us know, that in the "Strangers' Room," of the chief Liberal Club of London, a room where all visitors are shown, there hangs in the place of honor over the mantel a framed facsimile of our Declaration of Independence, while above it is a medallion with the superimposed silhouettes in low relief, of Washington, Lincoln and Grant. In the same room the Magna Charta occupies a less conspicuous position.

Fortunately, they are about as likely permanently to disturb or seriously to affect the relations between England and this country as their "Fatherland" is to realize its insane dream of "World Power." (See pp. 22, 38 *et seq.*)

They are circulating the speeches of some unimportant irreconcilables like Ramsay Macdonald in opposition to the war. Why don't they quote the communications of the German Humanity League, of Berlin, to the British Humanity League, in which the Kaiser is characterized as the "uncurbed tyrant, surrounded by parasites, and now directing the most desperate, devilish and selfish campaign ever waged against humanity," and as "the despot whose insatiable egotism is drenching Europe with the blood of its workers and wage earners?" (84)

Perhaps Münsterberg's book, "The War and America," best illustrates the fatuity of the German-American apologists as well as their awkward and stupid mixture of unpalatable flattery and unfriendly criticism.

The book has been admirably dissected by a recent reviewer. (85) Professor Münsterberg has received so much undeserved attention from our American journalists

that it is worth while to quote portions of this review.

"His method of argument seems directed at a singularly untrained public. . . . His major premises he never takes the pains to substantiate. Instead, he reiterates them as axiomatic. 'Culturally, Russia is Asia,' Russia desires to blot out Western European civilization, hence Germany is fighting for civilization against barbarism, in an inevitable conflict. These fundamental notions are drummed in with Prussian thoroughness. But these are just the postulates that a thoughtful reader wants to have proved. . . . Aside from bandying big impressive antitheses—Teuton and Slav, Europe, Asia, etc.—Professor Münsterberg varies his tactics by condescending flattery of America; and by occasional excursions in pure sentiment. The whole *mélange* is highly seasoned, and possibly grateful to the literary palate of the very simple reader for whom it is concocted.

"The omniscient tone of the plea is characteristic. . . . Such a generalization as that Europe means thought while Asia means feeling, and accordingly one must cut the other's throat, is admirably calculated to solve the vexed problem of West and East—in any corner grocery store. And for whom does Professor Münsterberg limn the picture of an idyllic, scholarly, industrial, unaggressive, and wholly pacific Germany reluctantly kept under arms by bellicose neighbors? Plainly, for a reader who has not heard of the partition of Poland, the seizing of Silesia, the grasping of Schleswig-Holstein, the annexation of Hanover, the retention of Alsace and Lorraine, and, only yesterday, the premature incorporation of Belgium into the German Empire.

"Then what kind of a reader is asked to swallow whole the theory of a ruthlessly aggressive Russia menacing all Western Europe? Evidently, a reader who does not know that, first, Russia set conquered Germany on her feet, then Austria threatened by the Hungarian revolution—a reader who does not know that in a hundred and fifty years, when Russia was strong and Central Europe a congeries of weak states, Russia showed no exceptional aggressiveness against European Powers.

. . . "We must note the kind of philosophical thought that underlies the surface rhetoric. It is a philosophy not overtly

expressed. It would hardly bear ventilation in America. You may sense it in the sharp distinction between 'routine agreements like the neutrality treaties,' and a 'pledge of international honor' like the Triple Alliance. Why is there no pledge of honor in a neutrality agreement? Plainly because it is made with and in behalf of a weak Power. Honor first begins among peers. Thus is honor made in the Germany of Zabern.

"Again consider the system of international morals implied in the following:

"It was the ethical duty of the Russians to strain every effort for the expansion of their influence, and it was the ethical duty of the Germans and Austrians to strain every effort to prevent it. In the same way, it was the moral right of France to make use of any hour of German embarrassment for recapturing its military glory by a victory of revenge. And it was the moral right of England to exert its energies for keeping control of the seas and for destroying the commercial rivalry of the Germans. No one is to be blamed.'

"International morality, that is, consists in the insensate inevitable clash of national egotisms, which, being national, are holy. . . .

"We have left dangling the very interesting question: For what kind of a reader is this skillful blend of dogmatism, innuendo, sophistry, and gush intended? Fortunately, Professor Münsterberg has the candor to make the matter clear. It is addressed to 'the American mind' which has an 'unusual degree of imitativeness and suggestibility.' It is addressed to the individual American who, when excited, tends to become 'a mere automatic mechanism in which the thoughts and feelings and impulses of his neighbor control his mind.' . . . 'There is a lack of individual resistance to prescribed opinions which produces in excited states a colorless wholesale judgment which may be entirely different from the natural stand of the sober single individual.' Elsewhere we learn that in all European matters the American is moved chiefly by a provincial prejudice against the paraphernalia and nomenclature of monarchy. He takes mere names for real things.

"Professor Münsterberg has produced a book that is precisely adapted to impress the sort of 'American mind,' he thus defines, but no other sort."

Even in his latest text-book of Psychology he evinces the same insufferable belief in essential racial superiority, saying: (p. 234)

"The Southern peoples are children of the moment; the Teutonic live in the things which lie beyond the world, in the infinite and the ineffable."

Mr. E. S. Martin (the editor of "Life") has paid his respects to Münsterberg as follows: (86)

"Your book must convince any un-German reader that we shall never see the case as you see it. The idea which you offer of simple, honest Germany taking a few indispensable military precautions against the ravening wolves of Europe, and especially against the impending hug of the terrible bear, is comic to us, Herr Doctor. We can't help it. With all due respect, we remember Frederick William and his tall grenadiers, Frederick the Great and Maria Theresa, Bismarck's Prussia and Austria in '66, and then what you call 'the war of 1870 recklessly stirred by the intolerance of Imperial France,' and since 1888 the Kaiser and his Krupps, and we smile, Herr Doctor; we just have to.

"Blood and iron is a great medicine, but Germany, as we see it, has overdosed herself with it. She has not made a friend in Europe since Bismarck died. They say he was overruled when Alsace and Lorraine were detached from France. They tell us the Kaiser was tricked into this war by the Prussian warhogs. Alas, Professor Münsterberg, it is not the Americans who are the enemies of Germany. You will find in due time that they do not hate the good Germans. The enemies of Germany have been men of her own household, the men who have not only dreamed, but published to the world what you scornfully describe as 'the fantastic dreams of the so-called Pan-Germans.' Why, since 1870, has Germany confidently expected another great war? Why has she ceaselessly trained men, built fortresses, cast guns, hoarded money and organized to the last detail a campaign against the rest of Europe? The reason, as we see it, is that the small class that guides the destinies of

her industrious millions has had 'God with Us' for its motto and 'Rule or Ruin' for its policy. Germany is a great country gone wrong. She is getting what her rulers have earned for her. They have made her an impossible nation; a menace to mankind. She has put her trust in force, alienated her natural allies, dishonored her treaties. Now her appeal to force has gone to judgment. If she conquers Europe ruin will find her in victory as it found Napoleon. If Europe conquers her she will get off easier; but either way she has terrible sorrows ahead of her and is a fit object of pity for all kind people."

One more extract from a thoughtful reviewer (John Cowper Powys), (87), of the Münsterberg book must suffice.

"With this end in view Professor Münsterberg sweeps aside all the reports about German brutality and German vandalism and concentrates his attention upon two main propositions: First, that Germany's preparations for the war were purely defensive; second, that Germany's defeat in the war would mean a devastating blow for 'culture,' and a disastrous setback to the best interests of humanity. With regard to those acts of German vandalism which he sweeps out of his path, Professor Münsterberg has only one word to say: 'Is there any truth in all this? Yes; one truth, which is undeniable, which is sad, which is awful, namely, that war is war.' To this interesting acknowledgement that war is a game with no rules, Professor Münsterberg adds the following charming example of airy and graceful humor: 'When the big headlines tell the reader again that the German soldiers slaughtered babies yesterday in the town which they captured, he will conjecture for himself that in reality they probably slaughtered some chickens for which they paid in full.'

In spite of his use of the term 'war is war,' as an answer to all critics of German war-methods, our Professor cannot resist the temptation to make certain 'side-issue' appeals to proverbial American opinion. 'The Americans,' says he, 'did not like Japan's mixing in on the side of England. This capturing of Germany's little colony in China by a sly trick, when Germany's hands were bound, had to awake sympathy in every American.

But this was outdone by the latest move of the campaign which has brought Hindus from India and Turcos from Africa into line against the German people. To force these colored races, which surely have not the slightest cause to fight the German nation, into battle against the Teutons, is an act which must have brought a feeling of shame for the Allies to every true American.'

"How naïve indeed must be the Professor's sense of American intelligence! Without the least disparagement to the attractive negro population in America, no one would for a moment think of comparing them to the children of the immemorial traditions of India. To introduce such a comparison at all with this invidious expression, 'colored races,' is only to throw the shadow of special pleading across the whole of his arguments."

All the most recent activities among the German-Americans confirm the view that at least their spokesmen are, at heart, Germans, with German ideals and aspirations absolutely incompatible with those of every far-seeing American. One of our leading papers (88), under the heading "A German-American Menace," discusses the situation as follows:

"Citizens of this country, whatever the land of their birth, have a perfect right to organize for any benevolent purpose that they approve. They can form societies, if they please, in order radically to alter our form of government or to induce it to change its foreign policy. If they are actuated by patriotic American motives, no one will object, however, he may disagree with the aim. But when this organizing is plainly in the interest of a foreign Government, and would inevitably result in dividing all Americans into two camps over an issue foreign to this country, those who undertake it are playing with extremely dangerous fire. It will tend to inject hatred and bitterness into our treatment of questions relating to our foreign affairs, at the worst possible time for such a display of partisanship. If ever there was an hour when patriotic

citizens should refrain from acts likely to embroil this Government at home or abroad, it is the present.

"Our German-Americans who are citizens, and not merely sojourners among us, were supposed when they took out their naturalization papers to have abandoned their allegiance to Germany, and to have sworn fealty to our institutions. Now many of them are acting as if they were never Americans at all, but merely Germans who live here for convenience. They are looking at this whole question, not from the American point of view, but the German. When they demand that all shipments of arms to Europe be stopped, it is because they favor Germany, and are working in her interest. When they say they desire to elect Congressmen who shall 'compel the Administration to enforce strict neutrality,' they mean that, since the laws, by reason of British control of the sea happen to favor the Allies, they wish those laws changed. If they happened to favor Germany we should hear not a word from the German-Americans. They are judging thus upon what will help Germany; how it affects the United States they care not at all. They are, for instance, outspoken not only against England, but against Japan; for Germany's sake they are playing upon the string of racial prejudice and are apparently quite willing to intensify the misunderstandings between the United States and the Mikado's people, without thought of the peril.

"For the first time they have raised the question of the loyalty of foreign-born citizens, not their loyalty in time of war, but that deeper, firmer, and nobler allegiance to our institutions which we have a right to expect of true Americans. For it is impossible to uphold German autocracy and American representative Government at the same time; they are too utterly dissimilar to make it possible. At bottom there are the same fundamental differences that existed when the men of 1848 fled to this country for political asylum. But those who are trying to raise up a German national party here in the reflected heat of the great struggle abroad overlook all this, as they do the probability of their opening serious cleavage between themselves and the other American citizens which will last for years to come. With the outcome of the war for Germany they have, strictly speaking, no more concern than the hundreds of thousands of Americans who are indebted to her for one cause or another. What they ought to be praying for is

an outcome which will so remodel German institutions as to make them more nearly like our own. What they ought to be striving for is to so bear themselves that at the end of the war they will have won golden opinions on this side of the water for their forbearance, for their tolerance, and their Americanism.

"Instead, the course they are threatening to pursue leads straight towards bitterness, sectionalism, and disorder in our political life. It is as if they sought to make themselves feared and disliked. As ex-President Taylor, of Vassar College, has put it: "This is not patriotism; it is pure alienism."

In spite of everything I cling to the hope that the support at present undoubtedly given to the German cause by our German-American citizens is a temporary manifestation of the strength of the ties of blood, and that they as a class are not fitly represented by their present spokesmen. I cannot believe that, however they may have been influenced by heredity, by the poisonous teachings of the Bernhardis and Treitschkes and by the flamboyant but spurious patriotism of the Münsterbergs and Ridders and Hilprechts, they will permanently espouse a cause which is based upon the idea that "there is no room in Germany for a president" for the reason that "the idea of a president is that he draws his power from the will of millions of individuals." It must be impossible that the kindly, sociable and lovable friends I have among the Germans here and abroad, can subscribe to the ethics of the Kaiser as expressed to the German soldiers despatched to China in 1900:

"When you meet the foe you will defeat him. No quarter will be given, no prisoners will be taken. Let all who fall into your hands be at your mercy. Just as the Huns, a thousand years ago, under the leadership of Etzel (Attila), gained a reputation, in virtue of which they still live in historical

tradition, so may the name of Germany become known in such a manner in China that no Chinaman will ever again even dare to look askance at a German." (89)

The reference to Attila was commonly suppressed, but the rest of the quotation was circulated on postcards throughout Germany. (90)

Two days later the modern Attila preached a sermon on board the *Hohenzollern*. (91)

I may, of course, be mistaken, but until the mistake is demonstrated I do not intend to include in my condemnation of the present "German-American" attitude any but those who have publicly put themselves on record. As for them, they should abandon the pretense of being even "hyphenated" Americans.

CHAPTER X.

What Is the Extent and What Are the Aims of the Organized German Propaganda in America?

For the last four or five months the country has been showered with pro-German pamphlets, leaflets, speeches, addresses, newspaper and magazine articles and political tracts. It has been argued with and lied to. It has been coaxed, fawned upon, wheedled, flattered, cajoled, importuned, bullied, and threatened. For example:

"A mixed audience of German-Americans and Irish-Americans, who packed Terrace Garden to-night at a meeting called by the New York Irish Volunteer Committee, cheered to the echoes the name of the Kaiser, hissed the New York newspapers, but did not cheer when the Stars and Stripes and the Government at Washington were mentioned.

"Wild applause followed when one of the speakers said that 'a union of the 20,000,000 German-Americans and 13,000,000 Irish-Americans in the United States would make it easily possible to change the attitude of the newspapers and the Federal Government toward Germany and the German cause.'

"The principal speaker of the evening was Dr. Kuno Meyer, of the University of Berlin, who has been in this country several weeks lecturing and speaking in behalf of Germany. . . .

"The programme opened and ended with music, but 'The Star-Spangled Banner' was not among the tunes played. Larkin was the first speaker. He immediately started to denounce England. He referred to John Redmond as a supporter of 'the blood-stained flag of England.'

"'There are 20,000,000 German-Americans and 13,000,000 Irish-Americans in the United States,' Larkin shouted, 'and if you act together you can make the United States and the news-

papers do as you like. I am not a citizen of the United States, and if they want to deport me to-morrow they can do it." (92)

In a report of the same meeting another paper (93) says:

"When the 'Wacht am Rhein' was played by the orchestra, Joseph P. Sheridan, Jr., who was reporting the meeting for the New York City News Association, was attacked by the First Lieutenant of the Irish Volunteers, who jabbed him in the stomach several times with the sheathed end of his sabre because Sheridan did not consider it his duty to stand up. . . .

"In Sheridan's own account of the assault made upon him, as sent out by the New York City News Association, he said that he was busy writing when he was suddenly struck with the sword, the Irish Volunteer Lieutenant who struck him shouting:

"'Stand up, you scoundrel!'"

Commenting on this shameful incident, still another New York paper (94), says editorially:

"No friend of England or France, no sympathizer with Belgium will protest if Professor Kuno Meyer, of the University of Berlin, and 'Jim' Larkin, of the docks of Dublin, continue each night to give further spectacles of a fusion between Kultur and Anarchy, such as they supplied in Terrace Garden last night.

"Any regret, protest, distress that such spectacles produce must come from Germans and their friends who realize how completely fatal to their own cause are such incidents, such insults to American colleges, newspapers, public opinion.

.

Do these agents seriously believe that they can make Americans Pro-German by becoming Anti-American themselves?"

The following day, in continuance, and speaking of Dr. Meyer, the same paper said: (95)

"It is regrettable that he is not now among us as an exponent of learning, that he is now infesting this neutral country as a passionate alien, seeking to inflame partisans of Germany. It is particularly sad to see so distinguished a victim of the epidemic *furor professorius*.

"It appears from the Berlin professor's remarks at the Terrace Garden last Thursday night that his engagement to lecture at Harvard was cancelled because the president of that university, having read the address to be delivered, decided that 'it would violate the spirit of neutrality which this country is trying to maintain,' which Professor Meyer is resolved that it shall not maintain. It is easy to believe that Professor Meyer cannot keep King George's head out of his remarks; but he conceives that freedom of speech has been trampled upon at Cambridge:

"I could not live or breathe in an atmosphere so close and dense as that which seems to prevail at Harvard. Free utterance between man and man has always been the breath of my nostrils."

"No considerations of propriety or politeness or respect for a neutral country occur to him. He assumes that academic freedom is violated because he cannot inject his political venom into a literary speech.

"How much freedom of speech would he enjoy at Berlin if he tried to incite an audience, say of Poles and Jews, to ally themselves against a Government friendly to the German Empire, against, say, 'the blood-stained flag of Austria'? What would the Prussian police have had to say to such a demonstration as that of Terrace Garden?

"He must have breathed asthmatically at this Clan-na-Gael-German-American riot, where a reporter was prodded divers times with a sheathed sabre by a lieutenant of Irish Volunteers for not rising with due observance and reverence when the 'Wacht am Rhein,' apparently the new American anthem, was struck up.

"There's 'freedom' for you. In Berlin the sabre would not have been sheathed."

It is a source of contentment that the vast majority of the press and a similar proportion of the intelligent people

—in whose hands the destinies of America will ultimately rest—have remained unshaken in their belief in the justice and right of the cause of the Allies, which belief they reached within a fortnight of the opening of the war. That they have thus steadfastly believed, in spite of the absence of any inspiring and steadying leadership from the present national Administration, and in the face of so widespread, vigorous, artful and unscrupulous a pro-German and anti-British campaign, is a legitimate cause of pride, and of confidence in the underlying common-sense of the American people.

Nevertheless, some of us have felt anxious as to the possible effect upon the millions who, somewhat removed from the main currents and counter-currents of world-thought, have been day by day, or week by week, bombarded with German sophisms and German sermons, German half-truths, and German falsehoods.

There are in the United States great numbers of newspapers that may, without derogation, be called “provincial” or “country.” As a rule, they are a source of strength and a means of education. Their editors are often the leaders of thought in their respective communities. Their teachings, while, of course, varying widely as to political questions, and representing opposite sides of political controversies, are, as a rule, devoted to the fundamental principles of true Democracy, as we understand it in America. Their owners or proprietors, who are often the editors themselves, are compelled to be satisfied with very moderate financial returns for their labors. They are, to an extent, like teachers and professors, obliged to find in certain collateral advantages—the dignity of their profession, the influence they can exert, the social position they acquire—a counterbalancing recompense for their meagre earnings.

To these papers have been sent, by the thousands, pages of matter—technically known as “patent insides”—already put in journalistic form, together with papier-maché moulds (from which type may be easily and inexpensively cast)—the so-called “boiler-plate”—all absolutely without cost to the papers, but with the fixed proviso that the stuff thus sent shall be used “entire or not at all.” A facsimile of one page of such proffered material, actually sent to a Philadelphia paper, is herewith given together with its translation.

For the arguments which the Germans based on this and other documents found at the same time, and the replies thereto see p. 124.

What the effect may be ultimately upon the hundreds of thousands of persons thus reached no one now can accurately determine. The resulting change of view, if there were any, would be slow in manifesting itself. But the possibility of such change cannot be denied or ignored, and it is a grave question whether the Allies, or their friends here, are wise in regarding this persistent and continuous effort as entirely negligible.

I am not unmindful of the advice of Charles Francis Adams to his English Friends, and to England, (96)

“As respects the war and the attitude of Great Britain, the situation is very clearly understood in America, and the current of public opinion is all one way, and in your favor. You can safely leave the course of events and the trend of opinion to the representative Germans in this country, including more especially the Ambassador at Washington, von Bernstorff, who strikes me as being utterly unfit for his position. He has done the German cause immense harm, and brought himself into great discredit. This, by indiscreet and unnecessary talking. The man apparently does not realize that foreign nations do

[illegible]

ACSMILE OF A PAGE OF "BOILER-PLATE"—MATRIX—SENT TO AMERICAN NEWSPAPER
BY THE "GERMAN INFORMATION SERVICE."

0007

GERMAN CIRCULAR LETTER.

With the matrix (or "mats") goes in each case a circular letter. In this instance it was as follows:

"To THE EDITORS—The mats inclosed are facsimiles of papers found among the documents of the Belgian General Staff at Brussels, referring to arrangement between the English military attachés and the Belgian Minister of War regarding British intervention in Belgium.

"They are accompanied by proofs of translations of the documents and by the explanatory remarks of Dr. Bernhard Dernburg, Privy Councillor of the German Empire and former German Minister to the Colonies.

"The mats and articles must be used in their entirety, or not at all.

"GERMAN INFORMATION SERVICE."

TRANSLATION OF FACSIMILE SENT THEREWITH.

"*Confidential:*

"The British Military Attaché asked to see General Jungbluth. The two gentlemen met on April 23rd.

"Lieutenant-Colonel Bridges told the General that England had at her disposal an army which could be sent to the Continent, composed of six divisions of infantry and eight brigades of cavalry—together 160,000 troops. She had also everything which is necessary for her to defend her insular territory. Everything is ready.

"At the time of the recent events, the British Government would have immediately effected a disembarkment in Belgium (*chez nous*), even if we had not asked for assistance.

"The General objected that for that our consent was necessary.

"The Military Attaché answered that he knew this, but that—since we were not able to prevent the Germans from passing through our country—England would have landed her troops in Belgium under all circumstances (*en tout état de cause*).

"As for the place of landing, the Military Attaché did not make a precise statement; he said that the coast was rather long, but the General knows that Mr. Bridges, during Easter, has paid daily visits to Zeebrugge from Ostende.

"The General added that we were, besides, perfectly able to prevent the Germans from passing through."

For full consideration of the charges based on this and accompanying documents, see pp. 263 to 276.

not like to be everlastingly instructed as to their obligations, their duties, and the direction in which their sympathies should go forth. They are apt to think that, not being wholly devoid of common sense, they are competent to form their own opinions. They therefore invariably resent the schoolmaster and the propagandist. . . .

"Moreover, as I have already intimated, the representative Germans over here are doing the cause of their 'Fatherland,' as they are pleased to call it, infinite injury. The sophistries and perversions of fact to which they have recourse are creative of even more amusement than disgust, and that is saying much. Under these circumstances you Englishmen, so far as America is concerned, can safely leave well enough alone. The current is all running your way, and the best thing you can do is to let it alone. The 'Scrap of Paper' episode, the brutal violation of Belgian neutrality, the destruction of Louvain, the bombardment of the cathedral at Rheims 'did the job' here most effectually, so far as the Germans are concerned. They are regarded now generally as a nation of neo-vandals."

But even if Mr. Adams is right, and I am disposed to agree with him, his advice does not, and should not, apply to Americans writing for Americans.

That the existence of an organized German propaganda here, as well as in other countries, is widely recognized might be further evidenced, if any more evidence were necessary, by hundreds of quotations from current periodical literature. The subjoined extract from an editorial in an American paper (97) proceeds, it will be seen, on such an assumption, and is selected for use here, because it gives an interesting explanation of the apparent failure of the pro-Germans to influence American opinion. It is headed: "Thinking' German and Other."

"Maximilian Harden, in his Berlin newspaper, the *Zukunft*, has had the courage to tell his countrymen the real reason why the opinion of neutral nations bears so strongly against Germany. It is not, he says, that 'they are not told the truth.' In

admitting this, Harden abandons as hopeless the whole German propaganda abroad, especially in the United States. It was based on the assumption that Americans had been fed upon lies, and that as soon as Germany should be able to get her case before them, they would at once change their mind. This was the theory of campaign of the German professors, of the individuals and the associations in Germany that began to flood the American mail with letters and publications, and of the various Germans who, officially or otherwise, have undertaken the defense of the German cause in this country. That the whole effort has come to nothing is obvious. American opinion remains what it was. Nor was it built upon falsehood. All this mighty attempt to set us right has not produced a single fact, a single document, a single argument which was not known in the United States from the beginning. The trouble was, as Maximilian Harden now states, not that we did not have the truth, but that we were 'unable to think as Germans do.'

"This is both frank and philosophic. It goes near to the root of the difficulty. Something of the same thought was expressed by President Eliot at the New England dinner when he said that the ideals of Germany were different from those of the United States. We Americans cannot bring ourselves to think, in all this matter of war, in the terms which are native to the German mind. What happens to an American when he tries to do it, is rather pathetically shown in a little pamphlet which has just reached us from Munich. It is from the pen of George Stuart Fullerton, well known as a professor of philosophy in Columbia University. He writes as 'An American to Americans,' and entitles his pamphlet, 'Why the German Nation Has Gone to War.'

"Now, will it be believed that in the entire production not a solitary explanation is offered of Germany's reasons for going to war. All that Professor Fullerton has done is to give a sympathetic interpretation of German militarism. He knows and loves the Germans, and seeks to make it clear how it was that a peaceable, scientific, music-loving people should have felt it necessary to arm to the teeth, to become a *Volk in Waffen*. All this is done intelligently and interestingly, but the war itself is described merely as 'inevitable.' Professor Fullerton says in so many words:

"I make no reference to the neutrality of Belgium, nor do I think it worth while to touch upon the question who first formally declared war on this side or on that. In the light of what the world now knows, these have become wholly *trivial matters*."

"But what is all this except a demonstration of the fact that when an American sets himself to thinking about the war as the Germans do, he instantly makes negligible what to the American mind has all along been and to-day continues central and vital?"

The question thus summarized as "Thinking,' German and Other," *i. e.*, so far as we are concerned, the radical difference between the outlook on life of the average German and that of the average American, is not to be lightly dismissed. Indeed there are Americans who consider it to be the underlying factor of the war, most worthy of study and investigation. I subjoin the best summary of this portion of the German controversial output that I have seen (98). It also expresses, I believe, the impression made upon this country by current German opinion as set forth in their own newspapers, and intended, therefore, not for American, but for home consumption.

"Among the great fundamental forces operating in the world war there is one which completely overshadows all others in importance and influence—the thought, the guiding purpose, of the German nation. No problem of the mighty conflict, whether touching its beginning, its conduct or its conclusion, can be studied without first taking into account this factor.

"What is that thought? What is the German viewpoint, the spirit which unifies and inspires the nation in its tremendous undertaking? Is there an authentic voice of the German people, whose utterance will reveal its own authority and carry its own conviction?

"The empire has not lacked spokesmen; the flood of current literature respecting Teuton politics is of astonishing volume.

Names which a few months ago were known here only to scholars or technical experts have become household words.

"He is a poor disputant who cannot quote from Heinrich von Treitschke, who dominated the great Prussian school of historians; from Nietzsche, the bewildering philosopher of negation, whose influence has saturated German teaching; from Von Bernhardi, the apostle of militarism; to say nothing of Von Buelow, diplomatist; Von Gwinner, financier; Harnack and Dryander, theologians; Lamprecht and Von Schmoller, political economists; Eucken and Haeckel, scientists, and a score of other noted leaders.

"But it is a curious fact that the most distinguished of these writers are quite ignored by advocates of the German cause; indeed, they are politely but firmly repudiated. It is said that Nietzsche has no considerable following; that General von Bernhardi is a military jingo whose extravagances were never taken seriously, and the greatest of German historians is gently dismissed by an eminent German-American in Philadelphia as 'a man named Treitschke.' So, for the purpose of this discussion, at least, we shall not turn to these familiar sources of German interpretation.

"By far the most effective representative of the cause in America has been Dr. Bernhard Dernburg, whose skill in advocacy is due not only to wide knowledge, but to the suave dignity of his controversial manner. That his mission is authoritative is not to be doubted, for his appearance was a signal for the retirement of those industrious but rather inept champions, Professor Münsterberg and Ambassador von Bernstorff. But Doctor Dernburg's writings are for non-German consumption only. They present an able defense of the national aims, but they do not pretend to voice the inner sentiments which move the people and their rulers. He is an attorney, not an interpreter.

"To get at German thought to-day, therefore, Americans must turn to Germany itself, to the publicists who address their countrymen and not aliens, and the newspapers which make and portray public opinion upon the issues of the war. In citing characteristic quotations, it will be our purpose to offer only enough editorial comment to serve as mortar between the bricks of German statement and argument.

"Making a random selection, we find Herr Basserman, leader

of the National Liberals, outlining in a speech to the Reichstag a popular view of the policy toward Belgium, France, and the world in general:

"Let us retain all the territory we already occupy, and also what we shall yet conquer and think necessary to keep. "Through bloody war to glorious victory" is our motto.'

"In the *Deutsche Tageszeitung* an article by a leading Berlin clergyman discusses war as a Christian duty in these terms:

"Again and again we read that warlike spirit, warlike enthusiasm and warfare in general are inconsistent with the spirit and teachings of Christianity. This view is superficial. According to the Christian viewpoint, history is guided by Him who shapes the destinies of nations. For those who believe this even war is the work of God.

"If this war is permitted by God, then warfare is a duty. . . . Such a duty and such fulfillment are not only consistent with Christianity, but are demanded by Christianity.'

"Hermann Sudermann, the noted dramatist, assures his countrymen that 'the "alleged" violation of Belgium's neutrality has been proved to be our legitimate right,' and therefore is able to urge solemnly:

"German militarism can never be misused for desires to attack and to conquer, and is only thinkable as an instrument of defense.'

"In *Das Frei Wort*, a Frankfort review, Count von Hoensbroech argues that Belgium must not be annexed. Justice and the imperial designs would be served, he says, upon these easy terms:

"All Belgian fortresses, except Antwerp, to be razed; Antwerp to have a German garrison; the Belgian monarchy to be replaced by German regents; the Belgian parliament to be restricted to economic matters; payment by Belgium of a "formidable" war indemnity and a yearly tribute; abolition of the Belgian army; cession of the Congo colony; Belgium's diplomatic affairs to be handled by German consuls and ministers.'

"A few weeks ago Dr. Adolf Lasson, an imperial privy counselor, wrote to a prominent Hollander a letter in which he said:

"Foreigner means enemy. No one can remain neutral to the German State and people. A man who is not a German knows nothing of Germany. We are morally and intellectually superior beyond all comparison as to our organizations and institutions.

. . . We Germans have no friends anywhere, because we are efficient and morally superior to all.'

'Major General von Disfurth, in the Hamburg *Nachrichten*, thus answers complaints against German war methods:

'Frankly, we are and must be barbarians, if by this we understand those who wage war relentlessly and to the uttermost degree. We owe no explanations to anyone. Every act of whatever nature committed by our troops for the purpose of discouraging, defeating and destroying our enemies is a brave act and a good deed. Our troops must achieve victory. What else matters?'

'Doctor Lenard, a member of the faculty at Heidelberg, is quoted in the Hamburger *Fremdenblatt* in these words:

'Down with all consideration for England's so-called culture! The central nest and supreme academy for all hypocrisy in the world, London, must be destroyed. No respect for the tombs of Shakespeare, Newton and Faraday!'

'Dr. Friedrich Naumann, editor of *Hilfe* (Berlin), thus frankly disposes of the neutrality issue:

'Even assuming that there had been in Belgium an honorable sentiment of neutrality, the question remains whether a small individual State can have a right to stand aside from a historical process of reconstruction. . . . However friendly and sympathetic one's attitude may be toward the wishes of neutrals, one cannot, in principle, admit their right to stand aside from the general processes of centralization in the leadership of humanity. In economics we constantly see small concerns trying to remain outside the trusts. Often they succeed, often they do not. The same thing happens also in the sphere of world politics.'

'Maximilian Harden is called the Bernard Shaw of Germany. But while his literary agility suggests that of the Irish dramatist, his genius is of infinitely greater brilliance, and his popular influence was proved when he smashed a corrupt ring that had its headquarters in the very palace of the Kaiser. Let him answer those who plead that war was forced on Germany:

'Cease the pitiful attempts to excuse Germany's action. . . . Not as weak-willed blunderers have we undertaken the fearful risk of this war. We willed it, because we had to will it and could will it. May the Teuton devil throttle those whiners

whose pleas for excuses make us ludicrous in these hours of lofty experience!

"We do not stand, and shall not place ourselves, before the court of Europe. Our power shall create new law in Europe. Germany strikes! If she conquers new realms for her genius, the priesthood of all the gods will sing songs of praise to the good war.

"Do not lapse into dreams about the "United States of Europe." . . . To the Belgians we are the arch-imp and the tenant of the pool of hell. We would remain so, even if every stone in Louvain and in Malines were replaced by its equivalent in gold.'

"The *Deutsche Tageszeitung*, in a long editorial, demands that German shall replace English as the world language, so as to end the 'fearful brutalizing influences' that appear 'in every land where the English language is spoken.'

"In the vocabulary of the *Berliner Tageblatt*, the Japanese are 'yellow Britons' and 'the monkey relatives of Sir Edward Grey.' The *Kreuzzeitung* tells its readers that British soldiers go to war 'without any thought except of shillings with which to purchase whisky.' Here is a glimpse of the popular mind respecting the war:

"We would see every monument, every picture, utterly destroyed rather than that the glorious work given to the German race should be hindered by so much as one hour's avoidable delay. The world can be revitalized, society ennobled and refined, only through the German spirit. The world must, for its own salvation, be Germanized.'

"From the *Frankfurter Zeitung*:

"Belgium, uselessly tortured and befooled by meaningless treaties and promises, is done with. Its ministers are still talking of victory, and even of a greater Belgium, but these are mere words of intoxication.'

"It is from such passages in the common literature of the day, rather than from writings of historians and philosophers, that one may derive an idea of popular German thought. There is a concentrated fury in its expression which is very striking; it is as if the words half strangled those who seek to utter them.

"With characteristic efficiency the Germans have classified and named this spirit. They call it the 'furor Germanicus,' and exult that it is so widespread and powerful. This, far

more than the ambitious designs of statesmen, is the ruling force in the war; it is this, rather than howitzers and submarines, that has withstood the might of Germany's enemies and may change the course of civilization."

The peculiarity of present-day German mental processes is also held up to scorn in the following editorial: (99)

"Among other documents lavishly distributed to the American public by the energetic German Press Bureau is a quarterly 'War Chronicle,' containing arguments and exhibits to prove the justice of the German cause, letters from soldiers at the front and pictures of British warships and other objects destroyed on sea or land. Not the least interesting feature of the latest issue is a map of Louvain intended to show the exact damage done to the city. The 'unshaded and undamaged portion' has an impressive look until examination reveals the fact that it does not include the center of the city, where naturally the worst destruction was wrought. It is as if Philadelphia from the City Hall to Independence Square had been wrecked; the area would seem small on a map of the whole city, but the injury would be none the less appalling.

"The inscription under this map of Louvain—"The lined portion only was damaged in the fight forced upon us"—is the chief matter of psychological interest, because it illustrates so aptly the curious working of the German mind. After all the absolute evidence to the contrary, Belgium in the rôle of *agent provocateur* remains an ineradicable obsession. And on the principle so lucidly laid down in 'The Hunting of the Snark,' that 'what I tell you three times is true,' Germany goes on presenting her case to the world as if this evidence did not exist. 'The fight forced upon us!' Does the idea still persist at Berlin that Americans are fools enough to believe that?"

It would seem quite incredible to Americans that any attempt to secure newspaper support on a large scale by bribery would be made, or if made, could be successful.

But Anton Oskar Klaussmann, in *Der Türmer* (Stuttgart) attributes the general dislike for Germany to system-

atic bribing of the foreign press. He includes us in his theory, which is apparently that all papers—except those of Germany—have been bribed, or are bribable. He says: (100)

“This misuse of the foreign press against us is part of the policy of the Iron Ring—England, France, and Russia. They have systematically depreciated us in the eyes of the world. They have “influenced” the foreign press. The almighty rouble, the world-conquering pound sterling, and the French franc have created accomplices, and for decades everything unpleasant that has happened anywhere in the world has been laid at our door by the press. This German-baiting has been conducted at the expense of reason and logic. They have charged us with things so senseless and foolish that one would have thought that even a half-witted person would be able to see the fallacies.’

“In spite of all the absurdities of the campaign against Germany’s virtues, the writer acknowledges that it has been a success, and proceeds to take the Government to task for not having initiated a counter-campaign of press bribery: . . .

“To be sure it would have cost millions to influence the foreign papers, for we should have had to bid higher than our enemies. But these millions would not have been wasted; they would have proved an excellent investment when that dark plot against us was hatched, and we found out, with despair, that we had not a friend left in the world. We should not have had to bear those hours of anxiety when we saw our so-called friends in America, in Sweden, in Denmark, in Spain, in Roumania, and in Italy overwhelming us with accusations and crying out to heaven that we had broken the peace, that our rapacity alone had caused the war.’

“Now that the war has started, he thinks it is a waste of time to attempt to influence the hostile papers, but he notes with some satisfaction that the powers in Berlin are no longer blind to the advantages accruing from a friendly press and have taken steps to insure support in certain quarters:

“‘What a hostile attitude was assumed by certain Italian papers during the early days of the war! In Berlin the names of these papers that suddenly dropped their hatred of Germany and wrote in our favor are well known, and it is quite under-

stood here that an ass with a load of gold has climbed over the wall of hatred for Germany.'"

This is most interesting and instructive. It seems to him impossible that the world generally could have disregarded German claims to world-power, disapproved of German ideals, and disliked German methods and measures, unless it had been influenced to do so by a venal press. Of course his view is confirmatory of all that has been said of German megalomania and of German insolence and stupidity also. Anything, to them, is believable rather than that, on her merits, Germany should be widely and spontaneously disliked.

For a further and more detailed illustration of the German-American methods, let me instance the case of the three Congressmen—with the apparently pertinent names of Bartholdt, Vollmer and Lobeck—who, the evidence shows, first tried to secure aid for Germany by the transparent device of prohibiting the sale of munitions of war to any belligerent; and who next undertook to fool the House of Representatives as to the German citizenship law.

Mr. Maurice Leon, of New York, has ably and vigorously dealt with this matter. He characterizes the legislation proposed by these Congressmen—forbidding all shipments to belligerents—as such an unequivocal espousal of Germany's interests as to call for immediate exposure, inasmuch as publicity in such important matters affects the vital interests and even the permanent safety of the American people. He gives his views of the activities of Congressmen of German descent as follows: (101)

"Representatives Bartholdt, Lobeck and Vollmer, when they speak of forcing an end to the war by cutting off all supplies from belligerents, know well that no supplies in any case can

reach Germany. Therefore, by 'belligerents' they mean 'Allies.'

"This is a characteristic German maneuver. I have no doubt but that these three Congressmen are carrying out the expressed wishes of Count von Bernstorff, the German Ambassador to this country, and Dr. Bernhard Dernburg, the German publicist.

"In view of the activities of Representatives Bartholdt, Loebeck and Vollmer, it is important to consider whether the allegiance of these gentlemen is primarily to the United States or to Germany. Their silence is transparent. They are acting as agents of the German Government in Congress. What they do dovetails with the activities of the German Ambassador.

"A true explanation of the whole matter is found in the principle laid down in the German imperial and State citizenship law, Article XXV, Paragraph 2.

"This law sanctions the following practice: A German desiring to exercise the franchise of this country goes to the German Consul and from him obtains the written consent of the German authorities to retain his German citizenship notwithstanding his naturalization.

"Having done that, he goes before a court in this country and takes an oath of allegiance which, according to our laws, requires him expressly to forswear allegiance to the German Empire. But that oath is not taken by him in good faith. He is not engaged in reality in becoming an American citizen, but in acquiring the right to use the American franchise although remaining a German subject.

"In this way the German Government connives at wholesale deception of the American Government and does so with the sanction of a law duly adopted by the Reichstag and bearing the signature of the German Emperor.

"The attitude of mind which this situation has engendered is admirably illustrated by two recent articles of Dr. Dernburg. In the current issue of the *North American Review* he shows Germany in the attitude of injured innocence protesting that she has nothing to gain and wishes to gain nothing by the war, while in the *Independent* for December 7th Dr. Dernburg discusses the terms upon which Germany would make peace, mentioning that Germany merely wants the Baltic provinces, Antwerp (which Dr. Dernburg, although formerly a Colonial Secretary, locates on the Rhine), customs control of Belgium,

Morocco, a sphere of influence in Asia Minor from the Persian Gulf to the Dardanelles and, as presents to Germany's friends, Egypt for Turkey and Finland for Sweden.

"If it is the same Dr. Dernburg who writes both of these articles, he must have a dual personality comparable to the dual nationality of the German-Americans represented by Herr Bartholdt, Herr Lobeck and Herr Vollmer."

This publication was met by vociferous denial from the Congressmen concerned, the character of which is sufficiently explained by Mr. Leon's further reply: (102)

"All the vituperation of Messrs. Bartholdt, Vollmer and Lobeck will avail them nothing. Such epithets as 'liar' and 'scoundrel,' which they find it convenient to utter in the shelter of the House of Representatives, have become a sort of Iron Cross which Pan-Germans bestow upon their opponents, and which are gratefully accepted as such. It is amazing to find that these Pan-Germans in Congress have been driven to such desperate devices as actually to try to deceive the House of Representatives concerning the tenor and effect of the German citizenship law. The text of that law, which was adopted by the Reichstag and Bundesrath and signed on July 22, 1913, by the German Emperor at Balholm on board the yacht Hohenzollern, is found in the supplement of the *American Journal of International Law* of July, 1914. Paragraph 2 in Article XXV of that law reads as follows:

"Citizenship is not lost by one who, before acquiring foreign citizenship, has secured on application the written consent of the competent authorities of his home State to retain his citizenship. Before this consent is given the German Consul is to be heard."

"That same law has provisions whereby one who, like Mr. Vollmer, was born in Iowa of a German father, may secretly contract German allegiance without establishing a German residence. These provisions are contained in Article XIII, sanctioning the re-Germanization of 'a former German who has not taken up his residence in Germany,' with the proviso: 'The same applies to one who is descended from a former German or has been adopted as a child of such.'"

"There is reason to believe that the law merely sanctioned an existing practice. Now these Congressmen even deny the existence of such a law.

"According to the newspapers Mr. Bartholdt made yesterday the following statement concerning the effect of that law:

"The facts are simply these: Germany, like every other country, has a law which makes it possible for those who are away from the Fatherland to retain their citizenship by reporting within ten years to a German Consul, but when so reporting they must make oath that they have not acquired or taken steps to acquire citizenship in any other country.'

"Let unhyphenated Americans compare Mr. Bartholdt's words with the words of the law and judge for themselves whether Mr. Bartholdt was or was not endeavoring to deceive his colleagues in the House of Representatives concerning a matter of vital consequence to the American Government.

"Mr. Bartholdt makes a denial that he has been conferring with the German Ambassador, a charge that has not been made, but he cannot and does not deny the fact that his activities as a Congressman dovetail with those of the German Ambassador.

"The newspapers have published during the last week items to the effect first, that the German Ambassador has charged American manufacturers with delivering dum dum bullets to the British Government by the million; second, that the American manufacturers named by the German Ambassador have absolutely denied that there is any truth in his assertion and have invited him to retract it or furnish proof; third, that the German Ambassador replied that he had the proof, but has not furnished it. While this was going on Representatives Bartholdt, Vollmer and Lobeck were actually engaged in their endeavor to line up the German-Americans behind the attempt to force through Congress legislation, the effect of which would be practically to enlist the services of the United States as the ally of Germany, Austria and Turkey. It is a fact of public notoriety that in that endeavor they are enjoying the active support of Mr. Viereck, editor of an organ which may be regarded as the mouthpiece of an invisible government established by Germany in these United States to rule over the German-American population, the head of which is Mr. Bernhard Dernburg, former German Cabinet Minister, now acting as a sort of local viceroy

over numerous organizations in this country embraced in the *Deutsche Americanische Verbund*."

The following editorial (103) on the question of German-American Citizenship," is representative of the feeling of all real Americans. After noting that under certain circumstances a German may obtain citizenship in a foreign country without forfeiting his citizenship in Germany, and re-quoting the law of July, 1913, it continues:

"There is no question of Germany's entire competence and right to make this arrangement for her sons domiciled in foreign lands. The conservation of her political interests is a matter for her own wisdom and prevision. But the effect of such a law on the citizenship of this country is a subject that must engage our earnest study, and if necessary cause the revision of our naturalization system to prevent the erection within our citizenship of a class of fraudulently hyphenated Americans unlike any heretofore existing.

"Under our liberal practice an invitation is given to all men of good disposition to acquire citizenship. The alien, on filing his declaration, must take oath that it is bona fide his intention to become a citizen of the United States and to renounce forever all allegiance and fidelity to any foreign State or ruler, and particularly to that one of which he may be a citizen or subject. Similarly, on the application for admission the alien must make oath that:

"He will support the Constitution of the United States, and that he absolutely and entirely renounces and abjures all allegiance and fidelity to every foreign prince, potentate, State or sovereignty; and particularly, by name, to the prince, potentate, State or sovereignty of which he was before a citizen or subject."

"It will be seen that this oath is as searching and inclusive as it well could be. The renunciation is forever, absolute and entire. No provision is made for a temporary or limited renunciation; the possibility of a dual citizenship, or subject-citizenship, is not contemplated by the law. Such a division

of loyalty, such a commingling of allegiances, as the retention of foreign citizenship in company with American citizenship, as might be accomplished by a German under the terms of the law quoted by Mr. Leon, would be repugnant to American institutions, subversive of American interests and against our public policy.

"That an honorable man could subscribe to the oaths required while reserving his original citizenship through formal arrangement with his native government is incredible."

I have, of course, had to select one incident out of many to illustrate in detail the German and German-American activity in America at this time. I chose this one because the three German-Americans who figure in it are law-makers and legislators for the American people, and because, for that reason, their sayings and doings acquire an adventurous interest quite apart from any other claim they might possess to occupy the attention of the public.

The *Courrier des Etats Unis*, of March 17, 1915, publishes the subjoined item:

"The Frankfort *Gazette* publishes the following letter addressed to a German lady by Mr. Richard Bartholdt, a member of the United States Congress:

"Committee on Foreign Affairs, Chamber of Congress, United States, Washington, January 31, 1915.

"Dear Madam: My best thanks for your letter. Unfortunately, I have not the time to inform you at length upon the situation. *The German-Americans are all faithful to the old country.* For the last five months I have been occupied night and day in spreading the truth. Yesterday took place here a conference of representatives of all the German associations of America. It was the first time that all the Germanic elements in the Republic thus united in one assembly. I was elected president of this central association.

"We shall know how to make ourselves heard.

"With you I wish a definite victory for Germany over perfidious England, and beg you to accept, etc., etc.

'RICHARD BARTHOLDT.'

If this is not authentic it should obviously be promptly disavowed. If it is authentic, comment upon such a letter, written on official paper, by a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, seems superfluous. I would simply ask for the incident the thoughtful attention of all Americans.

The Mr. Viereck, editor of the "*Fatherland*," which, by the way, is the journal that objected to America's sending food and clothing to the starving and homeless Belgians—was also good enough to suggest that we could "make a Christmas present to the world" by declining to sell to the Allies any munitions of war. Mr. Viereck is dealt with as follows (104) by a well-known American, Mr. Horace White.

"The interview in which Mr. Viereck, the editor of the German paper, the *Fatherland*, shows how the war in Europe might be brought to an end in sixty days or less, contains more enlightenment than appears on the surface. He says that the American people can work this miracle by stopping the sale of arms and ammunition to the Allies. Germany, having made war, and preparations for war, the chief concern of human existence, is presumably well supplied with guns and ammunition and manufactories thereof. She has the great Krupp works with 90,000 men working night and day and she has taken the Belgian arms factory at Liège and turned it to her own service against Belgium, with probably 10,000 men more. Now, if she can prevent France from getting arms from this side of the water, she can conquer her enemies in sixty days or less. That is what Mr. Viereck means by bringing the war to an end. He means ending it successfully to the country which began it. The American people are to enable the Germans to march into Paris in sixty days, or less!

"This achievement, Mr. Viereck thinks, would be the best Christmas present that the United States could make to the world. Put an end to the war within sixty days! But what then? Simply begin again *da capo*. Germany would levy contributions in cash and territory to suit herself, and, having thus

planted the seeds for future wars, would begin to prepare for them, and would still call them defensive wars. It is needless to say that the people of the American hemisphere are not contemplating any such Christmas gift, either as givers or receivers. They do not want this war to end merely as an armistice, to break out again as soon as the chief belligerent can get his second wind. The reasons which compel reflecting men and nations to think that an indecisive conclusion would be a calamity to the world are well presented in the last *Atlantic Monthly Magazine*, in an article by Lowes Dickinson, which shows that these ever-recurring holocausts can be controlled only by an international police force capable of throttling any unruly member, and that the real workers of the world must take into their own hands the issues of war and peace, and no longer leave those mighty questions to be decided by diplomats and brigadier-generals alone.

The enlightenment which Mr. Viereck casts upon the situation is that Germany is beginning to feel insecure in the situation in which she has placed herself. She needs some outside help in addition to that of the unspeakable Turk. She cannot see any new reinforcement, but if she can cut off the purchase of arms and ammunition by the Allies on this side of the water she can prolong the war or perhaps win victory in the end, so that the Christmas present would be all her own. And it would be called by the plausible name of neutrality. . . . Any new legislation which introduces a change of practice in favor of one belligerent and against another is a breach of neutrality. That is what Mr. Viereck proposes. His Christmas present is a change of law favorable to the Germans and adverse to the Allies. Much more might be said on this subject, but let us conclude by asking who is going to find bread for the 100,000 or more American wage-workers who are now earning their own living in our arms factories, if we pass a law to prohibit the exportation of their products?"

Americans should also ask: "Are the prohibitory laws we are urged to pass desirable or proper not only in this crisis but as the basis for a permanent policy?"

The Outlook (105), after having answered the first part

of this question in the negative on ethical and other grounds, proceeds to deal as follows with the effect of such laws as a precedent for future action on the part of other countries:

"Is the prohibition of exporting such supplies an act that we should regard as friendly and neutral if, the case being reversed, we were at war and wished to purchase supplies from a neutral power? At such a time as this the United States must make its decision, guided not by present sentiment and feeling alone, but by its convictions as to what it regards as the policy of permanent validity under all circumstances. Suppose the United States were at war with Great Britain and had swept the British navy from the seas (a supposition plainly contrary to any conceivable fact), and we were confining our operations to defense along the Canadian border; should we regard it as a friendly act on the part of Germany and France and Russia and the other European Powers if they jointly and severally refused to sell us clothing for our soldiers on the ground that they wished to be entirely neutral and to even matters up because England had lost her fleet? We do not think that Americans would consider that as a sign of neutrality and friendliness. If it would not be a sign of neutrality and friendliness on the part of Russia and France and Germany under those conditions, it would certainly not be a sign of neutrality on our part to do likewise under present conditions.

"We do not think, therefore, that the prohibition of the export of munitions of war can be justified on the ground of ethics, on the ground of neutrality, or on the ground of a consistent permanent policy."

In illustration of German-American methods, I may add another editorial from an American newspaper. (106)

It voices the sentiments of thousands of Americans, whose sympathies are with the Allies, but who disagree with me either as to the propriety, or as to the effective possibilities of our interference.

They may be depended upon at least to insist on genuine

neutrality and to resent bitterly any attempt to set a trap for us, which would leave us embroiled with Great Britain—the chief hope and the main object, so far as we are concerned, of the Pan-Germanists here and abroad.

“That Germany is deliberately trying to foster trouble between the United States and Great Britain should occasion no surprise. Tactically it is the logical thing for Germany to do, the thing that the precedents of ages recommend, the thing that England expected Germany to attempt. For months Germany has been looking for some pretext that could be so exaggerated as to arouse resentment in this country against the Allies. And, quite naturally, failing to find such a pretext, she will do her utmost to create one. A Board of Strategy that neither balked nor gagged at letting loose all the Moslem fanatics and dervishes upon the Christian world would hardly hesitate to break the one hundred years of peace that have existed among the English-speaking nations.

“Forewarned should mean forearmed. The Administration cannot be unaware of the motives and hopes that lie behind and control the stage at the present international situation. President Wilson’s neutrality must be as impartial and real in effect as it was prompt and emphatic in enunciation. The United States has too much at stake, is too essential to the work of world reconstruction after the war is over, and is far too wise and just to be drawn into a false position by the designs of any of the European combatants. America is genuinely committed to neutrality and must not violate it on any terms.”

The *Fatherland*, a pro-German weekly, published in English in this country, goes, as I have already noted, far beyond the prohibition of war materials. It said:

“Every nation in war has the right to crush the spirit of its enemy and starve it into submission if it can. We (the Americans) are denying this right to Germany, for we are sending food by the shipload to the enemies of Germany in order that they may go on fighting and killing.”

The meaning of this is that Americans are violating the principles of neutrality, are actually aiding the enemies of Germany, by sending food to keep life in the homeless, famished people of Belgium—not the army, but the helpless non-combatants. From the point of view of the *Fatherland*—a sympathetic title!—we do wrong to interfere, even by means of charity for helpless victims of war, with the German purpose to starve the women and children of an enemy.

This does not seem to require further comment except to note that this cheerful suggestion comes from the same German-American, who was so anxious, in the interests of humanity, to stop the sale of arms and ammunition to “belligerents.”

There is a serious side to the pro-German agitation that has been well brought out recently, apropos of an exhortation addressed to German-Americans by Herr Ridder, through his paper the New York *Staats Zeitung*: (107)

“It is well for those Americans of German extraction to ponder on the many grave problems which confront them owing to the war,” writes Mr. Ridder, who is convinced that “the drift of public opinion, driven by a press unfriendly toward Germany, requires a closer bond of sympathy between the friends of Germany.” The day draws near, he declares, when “the Allies, hard pressed, forced by their necessities, will demand of the United States even a more active co-operation than they are receiving at the present time,” and “against that day we must be organized to fight.” He continues:

“Each single and individual German residing in the United States or the descendant of a German must play his or her part in preaching the gospel of German justice and German fair play. Let an endless chain of discussion help to swing the balance back in favor of the cause we know to be just. There must be no shirkers, no drones in this campaign. The responsibility lies evenly on every one of you. We cannot resort to con-

scription, but must rely upon universal service of a voluntary character. . . .

"There are over two thousand German societies of one kind or another in Greater New York. Practically every German-speaking American, as well as thousands residing in New York, are members of one or more of these societies. Similarly in each great town the Germans and their descendants have proved loyal to the traditions upon which their lives are based. These societies form strong rallying-points for a campaign of education. . . .

"There have been no traitors to the German cause either among the 66,000,000 Germans in Germany or the many millions of Germans and their descendants in the United States. . . .

"I am not preaching sedition. I am preaching the highest form of loyalty that I know. We are a mixed people in the United States. We have come from the ends of the earth. We have all given our mite to the building up of this great country. We all deserve equally of it and it of us. There is no reason, therefore, why its destinies should be swayed more by the people who think as England thinks than by those who think as Germany does."

Replying to Mr. Ridder through the columns of the *New York Sun*, Mr. Maurice Leon writes:

"Organize for what? What is expected of German-Americans by Mr. Ridder and his associates? Here is the essence of the clarion call—"There have been no traitors to the German cause either among the 66,000,000 of Germans in Germany or among the many millions of Germans and their descendants in the United States."

"There in a nutshell is the Pan-German policy in the German citizenship law of July 22, 1913. Under that policy the 66,000,000 Germans in Germany and the many millions of Germans and their descendants in the United States are expected to stand as one man for the German cause, and Mr. Ridder now proclaims that anyone in this country coming under the all-inclusive description of the German Citizenship Law who does not stand by the German cause as steadfastly as the invaders of Belgium, northeast France, and Poland must be stigmatized as a traitor.

"Taking in this connection the Pan-German campaign conducted by German members of Congress under the convenient

cloak of a peace propaganda, gains a significance which has been clear so far to comparatively few of our citizens. It even leads one to suspect that the *Los Angeles Times* might be well informed in its disclosure of the preparations for a raid against Canada by a German force mobilized in California.

"Mr. Ridder's call to 'organize' is intended to be understood as meaning 'mobilize.' This mobilization is not to be largely military in character, at least for the present, but rather political. Dr. Dernburg, as boss of an enormous German political machine, is to be enabled to dictate to the American Government so that it will recognize the annexation of Belgium by the Kaiser. Once that is achieved, our Minister and Consuls in Belgium will be treated as meddlers concerning themselves improperly with matters affecting German subjects if they continue their activities in behalf of a prostrate people to whom the United States still stands as the symbol of human justice and pity."

I hope every American who is enough interested in this book to read it at all, will take time to think over the possibilities—not of danger, but of serious annoyance—disclosed by the above quotations.

The endeavor to arouse anti-British feeling has in venom and unscrupulousness been predominant, and obviously seems to the pro-German conspirators in this country their most promising line of effort. They continue to refer to every dispute or misunderstanding between this country and Great Britain, but particularly emphasize the attitude of the British governing classes at the time of our civil war. I shall digress here long enough to call attention to the fact that they might henceforth, in their efforts to get a "fair and moderate view of the situation," use the following quotations, taken from the files of one Philadelphia paper (108) in 1898 during our recent war with Spain.

"The *Tageblatt*: 'For a long time such an important enuncia-

tion of the head of a State has not met with such general disapproval. President McKinley's humanitarian phrases render the disagreeable impression even more lasting. The concluding passages are the least satisfactory of all." (April 18th.)

"*The Vossische Zeitung*: 'American policy in Cuba has been characterized by violence and hypocrisy, and has not a single ennobling feature.'" (April 22nd.)

"*The Kölnische Zeitung*: 'To expel Satan by Beelzebub can hardly be described as a result of genuine philanthropy.'" (April 23rd.)

"The organ of Prince Bismarck, *The Hamburger Nachrichten*, insists that Germany must follow the policy which will be the most useful to her own interests. 'It is wholly indifferent to Germans,' says the newspaper, 'whether Cuba remains a Spanish colony or becomes an independent American republic. But German-American interests must be watched and attention must be paid to the feelings of Germans in the United States.'" (April 25th.)

"*The Nachrichten*, however, characterizes the action of the United States as 'an insolent piece of presumption against the rest of the world; an absolutely unjustifiable outrage quite analogous to the interference by Greece in Crete,' but adds, 'Germany's theoretic opposition to Monroeism can only be practically enforced when German interests are directly concerned, which is not now the case. Therefore, *The Nachrichten* counsels the strictest neutrality, saying: 'It must be left to Spain, individually, to resent American insolence.'" (April 25th.)

"*The Schlesische Zeitung*: 'While, individually Germany may view with indignation the jingoistic rapacious, pharisaical game now playing at Washington, the same indignation must be felt in regard to the Spanish reign of terror in Cuba. The German Government has merely to guard the welfare and the interests of the German people. These bid us to let events take their own course.'" (April 25th.)

"*The Vorwärts*. 'The enemies are too unequal to admit of any supposition but that the war will end in the utter exhaustion of Spain. To Spain's loss, however, there will be no corresponding gain to the United States. Thus the war, no matter how it ends, means a great disaster, and even the dollar crazy Americans will hardly be able to call it 'good business'!"

"Cologne Volks Zeitung: 'We do not favor intervention in this war; but we are of the opinion that the European Powers ought to exert strong diplomatic pressure at the first opportunity in order to shorten the war. The Yankees are already swollen with pride. If they win another decisive victory hardly any European country will be able to consort with them diplomatically. In view of the unfriendly sentiments entertained in the United States toward Germany, and the many economic differences existing between the two countries, it is very possible that Germany may be the next victim of American impudence.'" (May 9th.)

"Prince Bismark condemns the war outright:

"The whole course of the Washington Administration has been insincere."

"My views are well understood. I have always held that war is only defensible after all other remedies have failed."

"The result of the war cannot be wholesome either to America or Europe. The United States will be forced to adopt an intermeddling policy, leading to unavoidable frictions. She thus abandoned her traditional peace policy, and, in order to maintain her position, she must become a military and naval power, an expensive luxury which her geographic position rendered unnecessary." (May 19th.)

"America's change of front means retrogression in the high sense of civilization. This is the main regrettable fact about this war." (May 19th.)

"*Tägliche Rundschau*: 'The British lion would rather roar than fight. It sounds well and costs nothing. But England finds herself confronted with the question of her very existence. Consequently the nation of shopkeepers suddenly raises the cry of "A kingdom for an alliance!" and behold an ally appears in the shape of Brother Jonathan. America with its mish-mash of waste pieces of nationality, millions of emigrant murderers, English tongue, and black, red and yellow skins suddenly becomes an Anglo-Saxon race.'" (May 23rd.)

"The *Militär-Wochenzeitung*, the leading army organ: 'Any attempt by the United States to effect the landing of large bodies of troops in Cuba before the raw and undisciplined hordes have had at least six months training will inevitably result in disastrous and wholesale slaughter. It is even very doubtful whether these so-called citizen soldiery will stand their ground against the veterans of Spain next fall. We only

need recall the first battle of Bull Run to become aware of the absence of staying qualities in these militia, badly led and worse drilled.'” (May 30th.)

A well-known and highly respected citizen of New York, Dr. George Haven Putnam, has sent to the *New York Times* a copy of his reply to a request to join the so-called German University League—another of the numerous aliases of the pro-German propaganda in this country. After pointing out his full appreciation of much that Germany has done, Mr. Putnam gives his reason for his detestation of her present attitude. Americans believe, he says, “that the preparation for this war had been made by Germany years back, and that the Servian incident merely served as a convenient occasion for the outbreak.

“We believe that the main purpose of the war is the destruction of the British Empire and the taking over of her Colonial possessions, to which Germany has long expected to become the heir. France stands between Germany and England and, to use the German words, ‘France must be crushed this time so thoroughly that she shall never again stand in the way of Germany.’ The unauthorized invasion and the devastation of Belgium seem to have been considered by the German ruler as but trivial incidents which should carry no weight in connection with this larger policy.

“I am myself an old soldier, and I have looked with increasing indignation at the manner in which Germany is conducting this war and at the barbarous precedents that in this 20th century are being made under German official orders. The destruction, by order, of Belgian cities, the taking of hostages, and the making of these hostages responsible for the actions of individuals whom they were not in a position to control; the shooting of many of these hostages; the appropriation for the use of the armies of the food which had been stored in Antwerp and elsewhere, so that the people in Belgium, now officially classed as ‘subjects of Germany,’ are dependent upon American charity to save them from starvation; the imposition upon these

starving and ruined communities of crushing indemnities—all these things impress Americans as contrary to the standards of modern civilization. The ruin brought upon Louvain can, it seems to us, be paralleled in modern history only by the destruction of Heidelberg by the troops of Louis XIV, but this instance of French barbarism is nearly 250 years back and ought assuredly not to have been imitated in this 20th century.

"We find ground, also, for indignation at the use of vessels of war and of Zeppelins for the killing of women and children and other unarmed citizens in undefended places. Such killing, which has nothing whatsoever to do with the direction of the work of campaigns, can only be classed as murder. With these views I can, therefore, not at this time at least, accept the companionship of German-Americans who are prepared to approve, defend, or excuse these actions."

And from Philadelphia went another reply to the same request:

"Dr. Hugo Kirbach, recording secretary, The German University League, New York.

"Sir—The circular letter from your league directed to my father, the late Dr. Horace Howard Furness, has come to my hands and has been opened by me, one of his executors. Were he still alive I am confident that his heart would be wrung by the sad spectacle of the degradation of Germany and the German people that he knew and loved when he was a student in 1854-56, and that honored him with a degree from Halle in 1878. That was the German life, and there were then the German ideals that inspired admiration.

Now I am sure his every fiber would cry out against the grievous wrongs that this Prussianized people have perpetrated before the eyes of the civilized world. How can they expect fair play, giving none? Where obtain trustworthy material bearing on German affairs that will not tend to plunge Germany deeper and deeper in the mire and make humane men and women avert their eyes in horror? No sophistry can excuse the breaking of solemn pledges between nations; no argument can justify the devastation of Belgium. False patriotism alone makes the American-Germans condone the sacrifice of the

flower of their fathers' country, and the agony of tears of the mothers and wives on the altar of commerce. Germany and Austria-Hungary are the invaders and have been from the start.

"Feeble though my influence may be I shall never move my pen nor raise my voice to justify or uphold German aims or ideals as exhibited in the present ghastly catastrophe; I condemn them from my heart of hearts. Yours,

"WILLIAM HENRY FURNESS, 3d."

One single illustration of the *extent* of the pro-German—and anti-American—propaganda must suffice; but it is of extreme significance.

The *Japan Times* (109) says editorially:

"This is no time for a kid-glove policy or for mere veiled hints at some indefinite 'influence' of which we must beware. We have had enough of kid-gloved 'publicity'; enough of innuendo and of suggestion.

"Some years ago a very great statesman, the Marquis Komura, then Minister for Foreign Affairs for Japan, in a carefully prepared, formal speech, denounced 'The forces of Evil.' . . .

"On the occasion of this memorable speech and reference to 'The Forces of Evil,' the Secretary of War for the United States was the guest of the Minister for Foreign Affairs. The speech was short, but it was very sincere. The reference to 'The Forces of Evil' was carefully and deliberately made. It was no offhand, after-dinner, courteous expression of regard from host to guest. It was not a balloon sent up to make a little whispering for an hour in the smoking-room. Marquis Komura intended that his reference to 'The Forces of Evil' should be heard throughout the world and it was so heard. Within a few hours of the delivery of the speech—consisting of less than one hundred and fifty words—it was read by millions of people in America and in Europe. 'The Forces of Evil' which were seeking and are seeking to sow discord between America and Japan were known to Marquis Komura as they are known to his successors and to the Government of Japan. It is with

these forces of evil that the friends of Japan have been at death grips for the last six years. It was to these German 'Forces of Evil' that the Marquis Komura issued his notable warning when he spoke across the table as courteous host to welcome guest and as good friend to good friend. It was an earnest warning to America of which, alas! but few took sufficient cognizance. But it *was* noted in Berlin. . . .

"The error of indifference and of '*laissez faire*' has had extremely grave results. Germany and its agents, in Japan and in America were startled, and kept silence for a time. The warning was heard and there was a marked inactivity among the mercenaries hired to sow discord and make a *casus belli* if possible between Japan and America. But the one warning was insufficient and soon 'The Forces of Evil' took heart of grace again. . . .

"For years the German 'Forces of Evil' in Japan, in China, in America and in Europe have intrigued and lied with the one end in view. 'Discord, discord and war,' has been the slogan of the German 'Forces of Evil.' Their agents have been our own neighbors and our friends—our own familiars and our guests. They have spied and lied and slandered in the press, in the home and in the club. They have bought men's souls and honor. They have paid well the prostitutes who wore the garb of decency and were received into our homes as of our own. In Japan and in China for the last six years this subornation of treachery has continued at a heavy cost to the treasury in Berlin, it is true, but alas! at still heavier cost to Japan and to America.

"Even to-day while Japan is treating the Germans resident here and non-combatant with a remarkable leniency, the German agents of 'The Forces of Evil' are at work. 'Discord, discord and war' is still their slogan.

"In America the agents of these same 'Forces of Evil' are desperately working to the same end.

"True 'Forces of Evil' are the Germans that have been all-pervading for the last ten years in America and for the last five in Japan. There are signs of an awakening in America and there is some hope that simultaneously both Japan and her good neighbor across the Pacific will awake to a realization of the extent of the havoc being wrought to good repute and neighborliness by the German 'Forces of Evil.'

An extract from a letter to me written by a prominent and influential American residing in Yokohama is evidence that the feeling and suspicion expressed in this editorial are not confined to newspaper offices:

"On the outbreak of the war with Russia, a friend of mine, coming down from Miyanoshita, saw at all the railway stations between there and Yokohama the people of the towns and surrounding villages gathered together to watch their troop trains going to the front. In the little hoods of all the little babies he saw crossed miniature *Japanese* and *United States flags!* . . ." The association of our flag with theirs was the spontaneous outburst from the hearts of the multitude. In the hour of utmost peril to their national existence it was their all-time *friends* they thought of! To whom is it due that in the space of less than nine years after this demonstration each country has been made to look on the other as an enemy to be looked out for? To whom can be traced all the reprehensible, senseless agitation in California against the Japanese—the 'Yellow Peril'?

"See the *name* of the reptile in the enclosed clipping! Not to speak of the fiendish work of the same kind done elsewhere to us, what more do we want for a *casus belli*? How long, O Lord, will we stand for this sort of thing?

"(Yokohama, Japan.)"

The clipping which he enclosed was the following:

[Asahi Service.]

"New York, Jan. 15.—Secretary *Scharenberg*, of the Federated Labor Party in California, brought before the State Legislature on January 15th a draft bill depriving Japanese from the right to lease land. As the Government party of the committee of the Legislature are opposed to the introduction of anti-Japanese bills, his bill will probably be killed in committee."

The Outlook (110) severely criticises an attempt of Admiral von Tirpitz, who in an interview spoke of Japan's

intention to make China a vassal and then militarize it, adding, "Then it will be time for America to look out." He also declared that Germany will "never abandon the white race." *The Outlook* continues:

"The use of the words 'white man' in connection with Asia is the crux of the whole difficulty. It stands for an ingrained sense of racial superiority and is the expression of a racial insolence which must be extirpated root and branch; it is a gratuitous and insulting reflection on the character, history, and ability of the great races in the East. Any attempts to stir up American feeling against Japan is distinctly a violation, if not of the rules of war, at least of the rules of honor. To poison the wells of national feeling is just as discreditable as to poison the wells from which men drink."

It says elsewhere: (111)

"The country does not yet understand that it is in danger of too readily accepting as truth propaganda in the interest of Germany and inimical to Japan; that its ignorance of Japanese sentiment and opinion is being used by rumor-mongers unfriendly to both Japan and America. Since Japan's participation in the war Americans have been warned many times from German sources to beware of Japan. Recently, indeed, a writer defending the Austro-German cause in the pages of *The Outlook* went so far as to point out the peril to which this country was exposed from an invasion from Canada led by Great Britain and supported by Japanese and Indian troops! This is an instance of the extent to which the Teutonic hostility to Japan may be carried. Many similar tales are being told in this country."

At this writing the pro-German and anti-British propaganda is going on as vigorously, as unscrupulously, but I think, as unsuccessfully as ever. They are, I believe, making more enemies than converts. They are arousing antagonism instead of sympathy, and distrust and suspi-

cion in place of confidence. I cannot see that they have made the least impression on the country outside of their fellow German-Americans, although, as I have said, (p. 194), it is difficult to estimate what effect, if any, their campaign through the country newspapers will have.

In my judgment the vast majority of non-German Americans agree with the editorial opinion well expressed under the caption: "Advice to German-Americans": (112)

"Representative Bartholdt and his associates are doing Germany no good, and they are doing themselves much harm, by their pernicious pro-German propaganda.

"When they threaten to carry Germany's case to the polls and make the German cause an issue in American politics, they are playing with dynamite. The American people will not tolerate such a campaign of alienism, and the chief sufferers will be the so-called German-Americans who plot it.

"Germany is the only country engaged in this war which has officially undertaken to manipulate American opinion. It is the only belligerent which maintains a lobby in the United States to incite public sentiment against other belligerents with which we are friendly. The only foreign element in this country which is assailing the President of the United States and seeking to bulldoze the Government of the United States is the German element, and that sort of thing can be easily overdone.

"When the representatives of German-American societies publicly pledge themselves in effect to oppose all candidates for office who will not sacrifice American interests to German interests, they are straining American patience to the breaking point.

"Long after this war is over Mr. Bartholdt and his associates will have to live in this country. Few of them will voluntarily return to Germany to help pay the cost of the conflict. Their real interests are all in the United States, and the sooner they reconcile themselves to being Americans the better.

"This country once had an alien law on its statute books. It might be very reluctant to enact a similar statute, but every

day such German-Americans as Richard Bartholdt are breaking down this reluctance."

The whole subject of the German-American propaganda has been reviewed, summarized and commented upon by the Philadelphia paper, whose editorials I have so often quoted. It contains in logical and readable form a synopsis of the history and present condition of the movement, and it expresses clearly and forcibly current representative American opinions. (113)

"When President Wilson issued his famous admonition to his countrymen to be 'neutral even in thought,' it was generally recognized as futile, if not foolish and unpatriotic. It served no good purpose to advocate a course that could be followed only by persons mentally unsexed or paralyzed. Every intelligent American has, and should have, opinions on the war.

"Those who regard it as a conflict in behalf of the sanctity of treaty obligations, the security of small nations and the defense of democratic principles against autocracy and militarism should have decided views and should be able to support them with evidence.

"No less is it legitimate for Americans to hold opinions directly opposed to these. Those who are German or Austrian or Turkish, in blood or sympathy, have a perfect right to declare that these countries were unjustly attacked; that they are fighting for the highest ideals, and that militarism and autocratic institutions are necessary to the development of an efficient civilization.

"American newspapers have done right in discussing these questions with the utmost freedom and in opening their columns to the advocates of both sides. The supporters of Germany have violated no obligation of citizenship in upholding her cause and condemning her enemies. Pro-German meetings, with cheers for the Kaiser and the singing of German songs, have revealed a curious devotion to un-American theories of government, but otherwise have not been objectionable.

"But all these rights have been conceded upon the assumption that the issue is between one group of belligerents and another.

It was taken for granted that no American citizen, however strong his sympathies for his fatherland, would falter in loyalty to this country or would put the interests of a foreign nation above those of America.

"In the early days of the war, while the German advance on Paris was under way, there were few signs of divided allegiance. But when the German retreat began there was a change, and it soon became clear that these citizens were ready to take sides, not only as between the belligerents, but as between one belligerent and the United States.

"The first evidence of this spirit was bitter denunciation of American newspapers for 'lying reports'; the news of the German retreat was assailed as a malicious invention, and the papers were accused of selling their columns for British gold. Then came savage criticism of American public opinion as ignorant and prejudiced.

"Later President Wilson and Secretary Bryan fell under displeasure as exponents of a neutrality that favored the Allies. This was particularly absurd, since the administration was so rigidly neutral that it failed even to register a diplomatic protest when international agreements to which it was a party were shamelessly violated.

"From this attitude developed a demand that the United States take the grossly unneutral action of forbidding the export of munitions of war, the only nations to be affected being those fighting Germany. Gradually the propaganda became marked by abuse and intimidation of public officials, and finally has taken shape in the formation of an organization which purposes to make the German cause an issue in the internal politics of this country.

"The National German-American League, formed at a secret meeting in Washington on January 30th, declares its aim is to 're-establish a genuine American neutrality and to uphold it free from commercial, financial or political subservience to foreign powers.' The statement would have more force if it were not for the fact that the promoters are all passionate advocates of Germany, while every act urged would involve an American move against Germany's enemies.

"When Congressman Bartholdt, Doctor Hexamer and the other 'neutrals' demand 'a free and open sea for the United States and unrestricted traffic in non-contraband goods,' they

mean that this government should attempt to nullify the Allies' control of the sea and should insist upon delivering cargoes to Germany.

"When they 'favor, as a strictly American policy, the immediate enactment of legislation prohibiting the export of arms and munitions of war,' they mean it as a strictly German policy, since it would directly favor Germany and directly injure her opponents, and would amount to active intervention in the war.

"When they urge 'establishment of an American merchant marine' they have in mind the purchase by the United States Government of \$40,000,000 worth of German ships which took refuge in American ports to escape the consequences of the war; and they advise this course regardless of the fact, as stated by Senator Root, that the government 'would buy a quarrel with every ship.' But the real purpose of the organization is made clear in the final paragraph of the statement of principles:

"We pledge ourselves, individually and collectively, to support only such candidates for public office, irrespective of party, who will place American interests above those of any other country and who will aid in eliminating all undue foreign influences from official life.'

"This declaration against 'foreign influences,' from men whose activity in government circles on behalf of a foreign power has been an offense and a scandal, is rather ludicrous. But that does not save the movement from being unpatriotic, mischievous and dangerous.

"The theory has been that this country was a 'melting pot' for the incoming members of all races; that in the crucible of its free institutions old patriotic instincts and prejudices would be fused into an Americanism that would ring true at every test. For the first time that belief has been tinged with doubt. For the first time we face the possibility that instead of a united nation, made up of loyal men of many bloods, this may become a people made up of groups of foreigners, whose first allegiance is not to the land which gave them shelter, but that which gave them or their fathers birth.

"Already the poisonous propaganda has been carried to extraordinary lengths. Its promoters are not satisfied with giving sentimental and moral support to one of the belligerents, as is their right, but they are endeavoring to foment American hatred

toward the others and to force this government into menacing controversies abroad.

"They not only denounce the Allies, but they decry America, assail its government and traduce its people. A well-known German-American of Philadelphia wrote recently to the *Kölnische Zeitung* that he was 'not proud' of this country, and that its flag should be stamped with the dollar mark as a symbol of national hypocrisy. The *Cologne Gazette* has printed a two-column article from its correspondent on this side, declaring that German-Americans are 'in danger of their lives' because of the 'bigotry and fanaticism' of Americans.

"The 'neutrality' meetings, as we have seen in Philadelphia, are neither neutral, nor American, nor German-American, but wholly German. The limit of sarcasm now is the phrase, 'as neutral as Pennypacker.' They even denounce the sending of food to the starving Belgians as an act unfriendly to their beloved fatherland and a violation of neutrality.

"Their activity in Washington is wholly in behalf of Germany; and we have seen the astonishing spectacle of members of the American Congress calling at the embassy of a foreign power to discuss legislation designed for the exclusive benefit of that power. Every action they propose would compromise American neutrality and endanger American peace and prosperity. All too plainly they have adopted the view urged upon all good Germans by Professor Adolph Lasson, of the University of Berlin:

" 'A foreigner is an enemy until he proves that he is not. One cannot rest neutral in relationship to German and the German people. Either one must consider Germany as the most perfect political creation that history has known, or one must approve her destruction.'

"The national design is foreshadowed by action taken a few days ago by the German-American Society of Passaic, N. J., which 'aims to support all endeavors in the interest of Germanism,' and issues this appeal:

" 'Come, all of you, German societies, German men and German women, so that, united offensively and defensively, with weapons of the spirit, we may help our beloved Germany onward. . . . We ask your speedy decision, in order to permit of an effective participation and lead in the spring campaign of 1915.'

"Such open repudiation of the first principles of American citizenship is startling enough, in view of the oath which every naturalized German must take, that:

"He absolutely and entirely renounces and abjures all allegiance and fidelity to every foreign prince, potentate, state or sovereignty, and particularly to Wilhelm II, German Emperor, of whom he was before a subject."

"But the spirit becomes understandable when it is recalled that the German Government encourages Germans to remain Germans wherever they go. It allows any one of German blood to become a citizen of Germany, even though he has never seen Germany and has no intention of taking up his residence there; and, since January 1, 1914, German emigrants have had the privilege of dual citizenship. The law effective from that date provides:

"German citizenship is not lost by one who, before acquiring foreign citizenship, has secured, on application, the written consent of the competent authorities of his home State to retain his citizenship."

"The leaders of German thought have sedulously taught that Germans leaving the fatherland should remain faithful to the empire and serve its interests before all others. During the Spanish-American war *Die Grenzboten*, the most influential political weekly in Germany, declared editorially:

"The number of Germans in the United States amounts to millions, but many of them have lost their native language or their native names. Nevertheless, German blood flows in their veins; and it is only required to gather them together under their former nationality in order to bring them back into the lap of their mother Germania."

"We have to consider that more than 3,000,000 Germans live as foreigners in the United States who are not personally interested in that country. A skillful German national policy should be able to manipulate that German multitude against the shameless American war speculators."

"Von Treitschke, the noted historian, warned his countrymen:

"To civilization at large the Anglicizing of the German-Americans means a heavy loss. . . . Among Germans there can no longer be any question that the civilization of mankind

suffers every time a German is transformed into a Yankee.

"And the incomparably frank Von Bernhardt writes:

"The isolated groups of Germans abroad greatly benefit our trade, since by preference they obtain their goods from Germany. But they may also be useful to us politically, as we discover in America."

"How far they are ready to go in being politically useful to Germany, Americans are now discovering. Of all the nations at war, Germany is the only one that maintains an organized literary and press bureau in this country; and of all our naturalized aliens, German-Americans alone have undertaken to make the war a political issue, to shape the policies of the government in the interest of a foreign power and to intimidate American officials in the performance of their duty.

"Happily, there are some of them whose conception of their duty as Americans is higher than this. There is no more valiant advocate of Germany against the Allies than Dr. Kuno Francke, of the faculty of Harvard, where he is head of the Germanic museum. But while his sympathies and convictions are with the empire, his honor is pledged to the United States; and his fine sense of patriotism should be inspiring to all of us. Declining to join in the pro-German political movement, he writes:

"My sympathies are wholly and fervently on the German side. But they cannot make me forget what seem to me my duties as an American citizen. I believe it would be against my duties as an American citizen if I were to take part in a propaganda the purpose of which will be thought to be to force our government into a hostile attitude toward England. . . . As a man of German blood, I might welcome the help which would accrue to Germany by such a conflict. But as an American citizen I cannot possibly support such a policy."

"Let us refrain from political organizations which would set Germans in this country apart as a class by themselves. It would foster hatred instead of sympathy; and only by gaining the sympathy of the majority of the American people can we German-Americans help the cause of our mother country."

"The movement is deplorable in every aspect. The German-Americans who are attempting to separate themselves from their countrymen should realize that, while their sympathies

may properly lie with a foreign nation against its foreign enemies, their interest and their loyalty lie with America, and that a German defeat would be for them far less a calamity than their segregation from the rest of the American people."

An analysis of this German-American movement, which is worthy of the most careful attention from every American citizen and which appeared (114) directly upon the announcement of its plans and purposes, is further evidence as to the way in which genuine Americans should and do regard it:

"There has been organized in Washington a league for the 're-establishment of real American neutrality, and to uphold it free from commercial, financial, and political subservience to foreign Powers.' The initial meeting of the new organization was presided over by a Congressman from Missouri, and three of his colleagues gave approval to the purpose of the meeting by their presence. What the league stands for is shown by the following resolution which it adopted as its platform:

"*Resolved*, That we, citizens of the United States, agree to effect a National organization the objects and purposes of which may be stated as follows:

"'1. In order to insure the possession of an independent news service we favor an American cable controlled by the Government of the United States.

"'2. We demand a free and open sea for the commerce of the United States and unrestricted traffic in non-contraband goods as defined by law.

"'3. We favor as a strictly American policy the immediate enactment of legislation prohibiting the export of arms, ammunition, and munitions of war.

"'4. We favor the establishment of an American merchant marine; and

"'5. We pledge ourselves individually and collectively to support only such candidates for public office, irrespective of party, who will place American interests above those of any other country, and who will aid in eliminating all undue foreign influence from official life.'

"Since this league seeks to justify its existence by claiming to be an American institution for the promotion of neutrality, it will be fair to judge it according to the standard of its professed ideals. Is it American? Is it neutral?

"An American citizen might very properly, so far as international relations are concerned, plead for Government ownership of the cables just as he might plead for Government ownership of the railways. The wisdom of such a plea as an argument for neutrality in war time is entirely another matter, and since the introduction of wireless telegraphy seems particularly irrelevant.

"The second article quoted above contains two misstatements of law and fact. American commerce in American bottoms is as free to-day as commerce can be in time of world war. American commerce in foreign bottoms, due to the preponderance of the English navy, is very much freer than it would be were the sea forces of the Powers at war evenly balanced in strength. Furthermore, by no international law has the question of contraband been given the exact seal of legal definition. Precedent, custom, and the needs of nations at war furnish the only existing rules for contraband. To meet an emergency as it arose the United States, in a military order, once included in the proscribed list escaped slaves. To meet another emergency, Germany or England has an equal right, or rather a better right, to prevent the importation of copper or picric acid or gasoline by an enemy country. Naturally, this right is dependent upon the possession of power to enforce it.

"The third proposition put forward by the League would indeed deserve to be ranked as a 'strictly American project,' for it is absolutely without precedent in international law or custom. Article VII of Convention 4, adopted at The Hague in 1907, specifically affirms the right of citizens in neutral nations to sell arms and ammunition to any belligerent. If so well-established a principle of international law is to be altered at all, it must be done in time of peace. To alter it now would in itself be a highly unneutral act in so far as it deprived any belligerent of a military advantage secured by sacrifice of treasure and life. . . .

"If this programme is, as it ought to be, judged by its inevitable effect, two things stand out very clearly:

"1. A definitely unneutral project is brought forward under the specious guise of promoting neutrality.

"2. Under a pretense of removing one foreign influence from American life it is proposed to throw the Government frankly under the influence of another, and this proposal is backed by a threat to employ racial politics in the domestic affairs of the American nation.

"This programme has apparently received the support of many respectable and intelligent German-Americans. The measure of its failure will be the measure by which American citizens of German birth succeed in understanding and realizing their duties toward the spirit of the American nation."

Further evidence as to the German-American attitude is to be found in some of my own recent experiences. As soon as the first edition of this little book appeared I began to receive, by mail, abusive communications; most of them were anonymous; the large majority gave internal evidence of Teutonic authorship. The names, real or fictitious, appended to a small number of them, were in all but a few instances, German in type.

The personal abuse and the personal threats are of too little importance to inflict upon my readers, except where they have more general significance; moreover, they were often too vulgar to be printable.

The interesting feature was in the frequent recurrence of sentences like these:

"If your plan should succeed, and America intervenes, you will find that you will have more on your hands than you anticipate. *There may even be mobilization!*"

"... the intelligent portion of our people, including the millions of German-Americans and Irish-Americans, *will know how to stop* the desire of our Anglo-phile jingoes to drag this country into war."

"You re-hash what your venomous and lying press has printed and re-printed since the beginning of the war. . . . The

American press has given voice to English statements from the beginning; has reported German atrocities which were really Belgian atrocities."

"You are fomenting discord *and rebellion*. You are *helping to bring on civil war*."

"We will show you before long what a liar you are and *will give you something to remember us by*."

"Don't forget, *when the time comes*, that there are millions of us in this country, and that one man *fighting within the in-trenchments* is worth ten in the open field."

These will serve as samples. They are exceedingly unimportant, but illustrate a certain phase of German-American activities.

Of course, some of them were amusing.

One excited German-American, after calling me "infamous," "treasonable," "abominable," and "shameless," says that I "am violating in open-faced manner" (as if I were a Waterbury watch) "the neutrality of the United States." He continues: "Professor White will yet hear more of his handicraft." He adds: (115)

"I heard from good authority that Professor White is the closest friend of Sir Treuves, the physician of King George, and visits him rather frequently. Now, may I ask Professor White what it was worth to him to be persuaded by his friends, George and Sir Treuves, to stir up the Americans by false and lying statements? May I ask what was the price?"

This precious document was signed K. Hentschel. I do not intend to tell him the price. That is a secret between Sir Treuves and me.

It must not be forgotten that the German-Americans, who hold meetings and pass resolutions of sympathy with "the Fatherland," also continue to try to palliate and explain away the outrage upon Belgium. They profess at one and the same time loyalty to the Kaiser and Germany,

and to the country of their adoption; to the apotheosis of militarism and officialism and to real Democracy; to the German Eagle and the Stars and Stripes. Congressmen (with German names) try to introduce legislation to prevent this country shipping supplies of any sort "to any belligerent"—this while the Allies control the seas. But when the obvious effect of their preposterous attempt to help Germany is exposed, and they are held up to ridicule, they rend the air with protestations of devotion to "one country and one flag." They all remind me of the woman described in the old song of the lumberjacks:

"There was a woman in our town—
In our town she did dwell.
She loved her husband tenderly
And another man twicet as well."

Two of the leading citizens of Philadelphia have expressed their views as to one phase of the German-American propaganda, the organization of so-called "neutrality leagues" throughout the country.

In response to an invitation to be a vice-president of a meeting of the "American Neutrality League," the Episcopal Bishop of Pennsylvania wrote: (116)

"From information which has come to me lately, both in Washington and here, I have learned that most of the agitation at present being made to prevent the shipping of war materials from this country to belligerent nations, is being made, not really in the interest of neutrality, but in hostility to the allied nations, and with the hope of helping Germany and Austria in their campaign. Is the proposed meeting here fairly chargeable with the same purpose? and if not, is there any available evidence to the contrary with which you can provide me?

"As an American citizen, pledged to uphold American ideals, I am altogether against Germany and Austria in this war, on

the ground that they are threatening, and would destroy, as far as they have opportunity, those political and personal liberties and rights which we Americans have made the foundations of our Government.

"Feeling as I do, you will readily understand that I cannot have part in any meeting or movement which has for its real object, whether or not explicitly avowed, the support of a cause to which I personally am resolutely opposed.

"Very sincerely yours,

"P. M. RHINELANDER,
"Bishop of Pennsylvania."

The ex-Attorney General of Pennsylvania declined the same invitation as follows: Noting that the meeting was for the purpose, among other things, of advocating the passage of laws to prevent the shipping of munitions of war to any belligerent nation, he continues: (117)

"Inasmuch as no munitions of war can be shipped to Germany, would it not be more appropriate if the purpose of the meeting was stated to be the passage of laws to prevent the shipment to either England or France of munitions of war? It is true that such laws might be construed as unfriendly acts to both England and France, but what difference would that make if thereby aid and comfort could be given to the Germans, who are making such a magnificent fight for the perpetuation of the principles of representative democratic government?

"Personally I have no patience with talk about a neutrality that will give aid or comfort to a Germany which is represented by the Hohenzollern family, who have more than once broken their plighted word to give the German people a form of representative government which would have enabled them to be heard and be a ruling force in the nation. Do you for one moment suppose that this most unrighteous war would ever have been begun if the German masses had been consulted? If you do, you are blind to the Social Democratic forces in Germany, which are a growing menace to Hohenzollern absolutism. In my opinion the continually increasing strength of the

Social Democratic party in Germany was one of the causes of this war.

"Irrespective of this view, however, is there any reason why a body of American citizens should unite in a public meeting under the guise of neutrals to urge the passage of laws that can only injure England and France and aid Germany, the destroyer of Louvain and the Cathedral of Rheims?

"Very truly yours,

(Signed) "M. HAMPTON TODD."

On the evening of the "neutrality" meeting, which these gentlemen declined to attend, "Die Wacht am Rhein" and "Deutschland über Alles," were sung by the assembled crowd!

Sometimes a concrete example of one's individual experience serves better to bring home the realization of a general situation than do many impersonal arguments. For this reason I reprint here part of a communication I sent to a Philadelphia paper, (118), which it published under the caption: "American Irritation at German Apologists."

"One of the causes of the existing and wide-spread irritation on the part of Americans toward some of the German-American apologists is illustrated in letters from Professor Morris Jastrow, Jr., and Mr. George Haven Putnam to the *New York Evening Post*. (December 19, 1914) in reference to the translation, or mistranslation of 'Deutschland über Alles,' the now famous German war song.

"Mr. Putnam in a 'Foreword' to an American edition of Treitschke's *Essays*' alluded to 'Deutschland über Alles' as implying the supremacy of Germans over all other peoples.

"Doctor Jastrow says that every German schoolboy knows that the proper translation is 'above everything else, Germany,' and adds that 'the subsequent lines of the song clearly show that the phrase expresses the same sentiment as 'My Country, 'Tis of Thee.' He further discloses his own sentiments by

remarking that 'at present, to be sure, it would be more appropriate for the Germans to sing '*Alles über Deutschland*.'

"Mr. Putnam in reply says that 'the interpretation given it in the past years has been, as Professor Jastrow *and other good Germans* point out, an expression simply of patriotic devotion to the Fatherland.' Here, in the words I have italicized, he, consciously or unconsciously, put his finger on the cause of irritation to which I have alluded. If that characterization were accepted by the 'German-Americans,' who write to our papers and appeal to our people, many of us, however radically we disagreed, might find excuse or palliation, even for views that seem subversive of all American ideals. Much could be forgiven to 'good Germans.' But that, during this period of stress and tension, persons obviously German in sympathy and belief should profess to be impartially representing America seems intolerable. Their right to express their views must be conceded, but the effort which, almost without exception, they make to be regarded as calm, judicial, philosophic, fairminded Americans should be resented.

"Professor Jastrow, for example, (*Public Ledger*, September 27, 1914), issues an article under the caption, 'An American Appeals for Fairness and Moderation Toward Germany.' Perhaps he had nothing to do with the head-line, but as throughout he uses 'we' as synonymous with Americans, the title is to that extent justified. It is not unfair to say that this 'appeal' was, in effect, a plea for Germany, containing a stab at England, a slur on America and an attempt to palliate the Belgian outrage.

"Later (*The Nation*, November 12, 1914) we find Professor Jastrow writing a sarcastic letter, in which—still using the 'we' for Americans—he tries to hold this country up to ridicule for the attention recently paid to the writings of Bernhardt and Treitschke, for the prevalent view of the actions and character of the Kaiser and for the widespread belief as to the possibility of German aggression, if Germany should win in this war.

"It is strange how he falls into the same error as do the paid agents of the German-American propaganda who 'trip up,' as Professor Jastrow would say, and continually sneer at and offend the very persons whose good will they are supposed to be soliciting.

"If we return to the subject of 'Deutschland über Alles' another source of irritation may be examined, viz., the way in which facts—often even trivial facts—are distorted for Americans upon the apparent assumption that we are either too careless or too unintelligent to recognize inaccuracies. . . . (See pp. 256, 282.)

"He and his co-conspirators against American sympathy with the Allies—at first spontaneous and instinctive, now reasoned and immutable—neglect to pay us even the perfunctory compliment of assuming that we have ordinary elementary information. But then Bernhardt says: 'The whole realm of human knowledge is concentrated in the German brain.'

"The Truth about 'Deutschland über Alles' (see p.), which was written in the 40's, seems to me to have been well defined by Mr. Putnam (*The Evening Post*, December 19, 1914): 'Under the war spirit, which has developed steadily since 1871 up to the outbreak in August, 1914, the term 'Deutschland über Alles' has (and very naturally) come to express the present war spirit of the Fatherland; a spirit which, as openly avowed, is connected with the necessity of breaking up the British Empire.

"Doctor Dernburg's description of it as 'a song of modesty' has elements of humor that some of his more serious misstatements lack.

"Professor Jastrow, in his correspondence with the *Post*, classes Mr. Putnam with those 'who write on Germany with the predetermined resolve to hold that country up as the plague-spot on the earth,' and says that they—whoever they may be—do not go to 'the sources' for their information, and therefore 'trip up.'

"In Professor Jastrow's communication to the *Public Ledger* (September 27, 1914,) he accused Colonel Roosevelt and a portion of the American people of 'advocating warfare as essential to the full strength of the nation.' In the same paper, on December 20, he retracts this, and acknowledges that it was a 'misstatement.'

"In *The Nation* of November 12, he said, in a defense of the German professors who have been accused, and truthfully accused—of helping to spread the teachings that brought on the war, that Professor Eduard Meyer, the historian, 'can have very little time or energy to devote to public agitation.' In

The Nation of December 10, Professor Lang, of Toronto, showed that a meeting of the International Students' Union of Berlin, held in February, 1913, developed into what an American clergyman, who was present, declared to be 'the most disgraceful scene he had witnessed in the course of many years' residence in Berlin,' and that this was largely due to Professor Meyer, who made a bitter attack on England, exalted the *Machtpolitik*, boasted that for Germany 'the time had not yet arrived' (he, of course, referred to *Der Tag*), and altogether made a great turmoil for one who was without 'time or energy to devote to public agitation.' It would look as though Professor Jastrow had on occasions neglected to go to 'the sources.'

"Professor Jastrow, in his most recent article, published to-day (*Public Ledger*, December 20), says that the difference between his 'friends' and himself is that the majority of them 'show a kind of secret glee' in condemning Germany, while he is 'exceedingly sorry for her.' I am not sure what sort of furtive pleasure is represented by 'secret glee,' nor can I imagine any one afraid to show openly to Professor Jastrow, or to any of the other 'good Germans,' any merriment one could extract from the tragic situation. But if the sorrowers for poor Germany would keep some of their sympathy for Belgium instead of seeking—as does Doctor Jastrow—for 'extenuating factors' to excuse her devastation there would be less distaste in the American mind for their perverted arguments. When simple counsels of common sense and self-preservation—justified a thousand-fold by subsequent events—are denounced as 'secret agreements' between England, France and Belgium; when injustice is condoned and brutality is ignored, how can we Americans obey Doctor Jastrow's behest and 'extend the hand of sympathy and good-will to *all* the unfortunate and warring nations?

"In his September article (the *Public Ledger*, September 2) Professor Jastrow devoted some space to sarcastic insinuations as to England's 'altruism' (which had not been claimed by her) and said that by the historian of the future 'the neutrality of Belgium will be regarded as a very minor factor, perhaps entirely negligible.'

"In December (the *Public Ledger*, December 20) we find him

regarding 'the English type of culture as representing on the whole the most harmonious combination of traits of mind and character,' though even yet he cannot help seeking for 'extenuating factors'—mythical though they may be—to justify the rape of Belgium.

"Perhaps in another three months he will be able once more to discharge the proper function of a scholar—"the function of detached criticism, of cool consideration, of insisting that facts, and all the relevant facts, be known and faced.

"Professor Jastrow overflows with admiration for Germany's 'high ideals' and dilates upon our debt to 'German culture, German learning, German thought.' He repeatedly speaks of what his friends say to him on the subject of the war. What his real friends should say to him is what Professor Lovejoy of Johns Hopkins, has said: 'To not a few Americans the spectacle presented of late by the leaders of German science and philosophy seems scarcely less than what a sincere lover of Germany has called it—"the greatest moral tragedy of the war.'"

That I am not alone in being irritated is shown by numerous articles in our most influential journals.

The attention of Americans is called, for example (119) to the bitter comment of the *Kölnische Zeitung*, the semi-official organ of the German Government, upon the full statement issued by our Department of State, reciting all the official international activities of our government since the beginning of the war. It was clearly convincing as to the absolute neutrality that had been observed in regard to all the matters dealt with. But the German paper described it as the work of "the mouthpiece of the brutal British standpoint," added that "American neutrality is only a thin veil, behind which is concealed eagerness to do England a good turn," and concluded: "If America respects only brute force, then we shall give full play to brute force."

The threat is insulting, but not surprising. Giving a

"full play to brute force" would require no change in German methods or German doctrines.

Our American paper which notes the above incident (120), continues:

"Our German friends, both in this country and abroad, ought to consider the question whether, in addition to being irritated themselves, justly or otherwise, they do not irritate others. They cannot drive Americans out of neutrality, but they may make it hard to be both neutral and non-irritated. This result may be brought about in various ways. One of them would be an effort to band together German-Americans as a group entirely apart from their fellow-citizens, swayed more by race than by patriotism. Professor Ostwald, of Leipzig, early in the war expressed the view that it was the mission of Germany to 'organize Europe.' For this he was rebuked by the university authorities, who repudiated his suggestion. At any rate, the United States does not wish to be 'organized' in any such way, as some German-Americans have proposed; and foolish talk about it is distinctly irritating. So is such a fantastic exaggeration as that fallen into by Dr. Dernburg in his speech at Minneapolis last week. He, in general, has been the most discreet, as he has been the ablest, of the men in charge of the German propaganda in this country, but on this occasion his hand lost its cunning. He gravely argued that the Allies were really making war upon the United States. And then he went on to explain that, if we did not do something to help Germany win, Germany would learn how to get on without American exports. In place of wheat, she will eat rye; for lumber, she will substitute steel; instead of copper, she will make use of 'alloys of cheaper metals,' and, finally, dropping cotton, she will go back to the use of flax! Americans cannot help laughing at this, but there is necessarily a certain tinge of irritation in the laughter.

"Italy is another neutral country in which the German campaign of apology, defence, and resentment has not had the happiest effects. An Italian colleague rather roughly handles, in the *Corriere della Sera*, the embattled German professors. It is Professor Piero Giacosa, of the University of Turin. He passes in review the various deliverances of Professors Eucken,

Harnack, and Wundt, and gives particular attention to the famous 'round robin' of the eighty-nine élite of the German universities. This has been writ in Italian—far from 'choice,' Professor Giacosa asserts. Upon it he makes very much the comment uttered by President Hibben, of Princeton, that it is surprising to find eminent philosophers signing a statement so full of logical contradictions and unverified assertions. Science, declares the Italian professor, should be the same thing in war as in peace. He adds that 'truth cannot be mobilized.' If there is any justification of war, it must be truth and right; but 'this truth and right ought to be human—not purely German.'

"A German professor has sought to explain the ferocious exhortations of the Kaiser, addressed to the German troops setting out for China, as due to a 'momentaneous nervousity.' The German propagandists should pause to reflect whether their exertions are not producing among all neutrals a nervousity something more than momentaneous."

As this book goes to press there appears (121) a summary of American opinion, that covers the entire country and which I therefore quote, in part, as a final contribution not only to this study of the extent and the aims of the German propaganda, but also as evidence of the way in which it is impressing the average American:

"Although the nation-wide organization launched in Washington on January 30th by fifty-eight representative German-Americans declares its chief aim to be the re-establishment of 'genuine American neutrality,' its critics do not hesitate to denounce it as an attempt to coerce the United States Government into taking an actively pro-German stand. 'The wickedness of the scheme lies in its purpose to create friction between England and the United States,' declares the *Boston Transcript*. The men behind the movement, says the *Springfield Republican*, reveal themselves as 'more German than American,' and the *New York Times* is convinced that 'never since the foundation of the Republic has any body of men assembled here who were more completely subservient to a foreign Power and to foreign influence, and none ever proclaimed the un-

American spirit more openly.' 'The sole object of the promoters of this movement is to drive the United States from its present position of neutrality,' affirms the *New York Herald*. The position they ask us to abandon, says the *New York Sun*, is 'historically, legally, and morally correct,' while the course they urge upon us amounts virtually to 'the enlistment of the American people under the flag of Germany.' These men, declares the *New York World*, 'are doing Germany no good, and themselves much harm, by their pernicious pro-German propaganda.' The movement, in the opinion of the *Philadelphia Public Ledger*, represents 'a pro-German plot,' and the *Brooklyn Eagle* suggests that the activities of its promoters bear a close resemblance to treason. . . .

"A German-American protest against the program of the Washington conference is voiced by the *New York Volkszeitung* (Labor), which denounces the movement as 'a dangerous agitation' which 'seeks to embroil the United States in a war with England.' 'Under the hypocritical pretense of preserving America's neutrality, this organization would actually imperil it,' declares this workers' organ, which calls upon 'every German-American workingman in this country' to oppose the movement 'with all his strength.'

"On the other hand, the majority of the German-American papers that have reached us are in accord with the *New York Staats-Zeitung*, the *St. Louis Westliche Post*, and the *Chicago Staats-Zeitung* in their hearty indorsement of the movement launched by the Washington conference. In his signed editorial in the *New York Staats-Zeitung*, Mr. Herman Ridder declares that the conference 'was dominated by Americans and was designed to promote a policy which may be tritely described as "America for Americans"'—a fact, he says, which will be made clear by 'an intelligent and unbiased perusal of the resolutions adopted.' . . .

"Among the men who fathered these resolutions we find Dr. C. J. Hexamer, president of the German-American National Alliance of Philadelphia, an organization already claiming a membership of 2,000,000; Congressmen Bartholdt, Vollmer, Barchfeld, Lobeck, and Porter; Professors William R. Shepherd, of Columbia; Edmund von Mach, of Harvard; A. B. Faust, of Cornell; John Devoy, editor of the *New York Gaelic*

American; and many editors of German-American papers and heads of German-American societies.

"Herman Ridder, in his New York *Staats-Zeitung*, declares that 'any newspaper in the United States which will not subscribe to these resolutions may be branded offhand as un-American.' The call, he says, 'was only for the freedom of the United States from the subtle machinations of Great Britain and the subserviency of our present Administration to Great Britain.'

"Turning to another organ of German-American opinion, the New York *Fatherland*, we find an outspoken editorial signed by George Sylvester Viereck, one of the delegates to the Washington conference on organization. Mr. Viereck, like Mr. Ridder, is convinced that the platform adopted is one on which every American can stand. In fact, he goes further, and declares that 'no man who refuses to stand upon it is an honest American.' If the resolutions really reflected German-American opinion, he says, 'they would be ten times more emphatic!' We learn from Mr. Viereck that the patience of the German-Americans 'is at an end,' and that henceforth they 'will fight as a unit.' 'If you say that we are not Americans,' he declares, 'then you will have to change your conception of American.' He goes on with these frank statements:

"'We are tired of playing the part of Cinderella in American politics. We claim our seat at the banquet-table. If you say that we are not Americans, then you will have to change your conception of American. We refuse to be strangled by the dead hand of the past reaching from the graves of the Pilgrim Fathers into the living present. We shall rewrite the word American, to the extent of our power, in terms of our own ethnic complexion. . . .

"'We have suffered much without complaint. But our patience is at an end. . . .

"'You have sown the storm, you shall reap the whirlwind. You have refused to listen to our reasoning. You were deaf to our pleas. We shall go into the arena of politics. We shall try to beat you at your own game. One hundred and seventy members of Congress are of Irish extraction. There is no reason why they should not be joined by one hundred and seventy of German extraction. There is no reason why we should not labor for the election of men of our own blood who are in accord

with our principles, which are also the principles of true Americanism.

"'We are with America, right or wrong, at all times. But we prefer America right to America wrong. We now propose to set America right.'

"President Wilson is quoted in Washington dispatches as saying that the efforts of organizations to influence this Government's action in regard to the war are 'extremely embarrassing,' and that it is the duty of all citizens of this country to 'think of America first.' He is also credited with the remark that 'the present international situation should not be capitalized by standpat Representatives to play petty politics.' But if we may judge by the comment of the St. Louis *Mississippi Blätter*, political embarrassment for the present Administration is part of the new league's program. Says the St. Louis paper:

"'This move will work a revolution, as the candidates at the next election will stand for neutrality and will not dance to the tune of the pipes of the State Department at Washington.'

"A long-distance but interested observer of the situation, the *Berliner Tageblatt*, is confident that 'when the German-Americans and the Irish hold together they are a power in the United States which, in certain circumstances, can decide the Presidency.' And it is generally believed in Washington, according to the correspondent of the New York *Sun*, that the league will be 'a formidable factor in the approaching Presidential primaries and the 1916 campaign.' This aspect of its proposed activities comes in for special condemnation at the hands of our press. This movement to take international questions into national politics 'is obviously intended to serve the interests of Germany only,' remarks the Philadelphia *Public Ledger*, and the Brooklyn *Eagle* describes it as 'unfurling a foreign flag at Washington.' The attempt to 'line-up' the 'so-called German vote' and use it as a club in American politics, says the New York *Herald*, is 'foolish, futile, and dangerous.' To the New York *Sun* the effort represents 'presumptuous stupidity and arrogant disloyalty.' The new organization can best 'aid in eliminating all undue foreign influence from American life,' remarks the Springfield *Republican*, 'by promptly disbanding.' Its program in regard to candidates for public office,

says the New York *Globe*, is an effort to coerce by political boycott. The same paper adds:

"The present attempt will be rebuked if it gathers enough headway to be a menace. The political boycott that the resolution proclaims will be futile. It will attract votes to the proscribed. Those who wish to increase pro-German sentiment in this country have committed a great blunder by a threat which will be generally and properly interpreted as indicating a desire to put the interests and the ideals of another country first."

It is difficult, in spite of all this evidence, to believe that there is any real danger from persons who, when their "Fatherland" is in deadly peril, pass resolutions in regard to it, and remain at a distance of three thousand miles to sing about it vociferously.

Many of us are asking the questions propounded by Miss Repplier: (122)

"If the German-Americans are consumed with love for their Fatherland, and for their Fatherland alone, why, we wonder, did they not stay upon that sacred soil? This pleasure and privilege might have been theirs without the asking, and they resigned it as alacritously as though paternal rule and military service found no favor in their eyes. Why, when they came to the United States, did they not remain German citizens, and liable to be summoned to their country's aid, instead of hastening to swear allegiance to a Constitution which they regard only as a convenience and a protection? Why, when the declaration of war found them in Munich, or Frankfort, or Berlin, did they scuttle home as fast as ships could carry them, clamorously declaring themselves American citizens in Germany, and singing the 'Wacht am Rhein' with ever-increasing fervor as they neared the friendly shores of New York? Why, instead of forming political parties to support 'with weapons of the spirit [a fancy name for votes] all endeavors in the interests of Germanism'—which is a denial of neutrality and citizenship—do they not go bravely back and strike one honest blow in open battle for their imperiled Fatherland?

"The trenches of Flanders and the snowfields of Poland await these loyal sons of Germany, and, while many dry eyes will witness their departure, we owe and give unfaltering respect to men gallant enough to lay down their lives for their country."

CHAPTER XI.

How Much Reliance is to be Placed Upon Statements Emanating from Germany at This Time?

We have been deluged with complaints of the "unfairness" with which Germany's case has been presented to the world, the "lies" that have been told about her, the "double facedness" of many of our newspapers. Even the German Chancellor—the same chancellor who on July 28th was, according to Mr. Beck, guilty of a "pitiful and insincere quibble," and whose Secretary of State on July 29th he says told a "stupid falsehood"—on September 2d, by authority of the Emperor, took the trouble to convey to the American people his confidence that it would not "allow itself to be deceived through the war of falsehood which our enemies are conducting against us."

We know what to think of the Chancellor's veracity. The small fry—the Münsterbergs and Hilprechts—are shrill in their clamorous accusations of unfairness and mendacity, including all their opponents and some of us. Dr. Hilprecht, Heaven save the mark, calls Sir Edward Grey an "arch deceiver," and accuses (123)

"all our four principal enemies, against whom thus far battles have been fought—the Belgians, the English, the French and the Russians—government, soldiers and population alike, of having wilfully, cowardly and cruelly, broken the sacred pledges given by their representatives at The Hague conference before God and mankind."

In support of one part of this statement, he says :

"The British dum-dum cartridges taken from the first original package, opened in the presence of the war correspondents, show the inscription, 'Art Dept. Ive.' at the bottom of their brass casings."

One would think that he'd be chary of adducing "inscriptions" as evidence of *anything*.

Fortunately, we have a better test of Germany's reliability as to truth at this juncture than could be afforded by either Chancellors or archaeologists.

Perhaps the most astonishing effort to influence American opinion is the 73-page pamphlet entitled "Truth About Germany: Facts About the War." If it had been headed "Falsehoods About Germany: Lies About the War" the title would have been more accurately descriptive. Professor Lovejoy, of Johns Hopkins, has fitly characterized it as "a clumsy compilation of fictions, irrelevancies and vulgar appeals to what are apparently conceived to be American prejudices." He specifies some of the direct falsehoods:

"1. The pamphlet (124) says that Austria-Hungary *was able to prove* that the Servian government had been responsible for the plan of the assassination at Sarajevo.

"2. Austria-Hungary addressed to the Servian government a number of demands which aimed at nothing but the suppression of the anti-Austrian propaganda. Servia was on the point of accepting the demand, when there arrived a dispatch from St. Petersburg, and Servia mobilized. Then Austria had to act. Thus arose the Austro-Servian war.

"3. Great Britain asked that Germany should allow French and Belgian troops to form on Belgian territory for a march against our frontier . . . England and France were resolved not to respect the neutrality of Belgium . . . (They) did not give up their plan of attacking Germany through Belgium.

"4. England aims at being mistress of the Old World in order to occupy either an equal, or a menacing, position towards the New World. *For this purpose she has encouraged this war.*"

Professor Lovejoy (125) adds:

"Every American recipient of the pamphlet who subsequently took the trouble to examine the entire published evidence in the case must have speedily discovered the statements of specific historical fact in the passages cited to be either direct falsehoods or *suggestiones falsi*. But it should be added that the publication in question is marked by a yet more singular *suppressio veri*; it contains no hint of what are perhaps the two most decisive of the 'facts about the war.' These, since they seem to have been less emphasized in America than they deserve to be, should perhaps be indicated specifically.

"It is a fact undisclosed in the pamphlet that on July 30, and again in a modified form on July 31, the Russian government communicated to the German government an undertaking to 'stop all military preparations' (or 'to maintain a waiting attitude') if Austria would consent to 'stay the march of her troops on Servian territory and, recognizing that the Austro-Servian conflict has assumed the character of a question of general European interest, to admit that the Great Powers may examine the satisfaction which Servia can accord to the Austro-Hungarian government without injury to her rights as a sovereign state and to her independence.'

"It is a fact equally undisclosed in this repository of information about the causes of the war, that on the morning of July 31, Sir Edward Grey declared to the German Ambassador in London that 'if Germany could get any reasonable proposal put forward which made it clear that Germany and Austria were striving to preserve European peace, and that Russia and France would be unreasonable if they rejected it,' he would 'support it at St. Petersburg and Paris, and go the length of saying that if Russia and France would not accept it his Majesty's government would have nothing more to do with the consequences.'

"The most illuminating 'truth about Germany' is that, on the same day, with these two pledges before it, the government

at Berlin sent to Russia and to France *ultimata* which were certain, and therefore were manifestly designed, to render war within twenty-four hours inevitable."

The pamphlet "Truth About Germany" was prepared by a Board of Editors which included many of the best-known men in letters, science, finance and German public life. As Lovejoy says, the pamphlet seems to show that the very class that among cultivated persons of other countries has gained for Germany its greatest distinction,

"has signally failed at the most critical moment in German history, to perform its proper function—the function of detached criticism, of cool consideration, of insisting that facts and all the relevant facts, be known and faced. It appears to be shouting with the rest for a wholly avoidable war of which, in nearly all non-German eyes, the moral indefensibility seems exceeded only by its fatal unwisdom from a purely national point of view."

The astounding spectacle presented by this Board of Editors is partly explained by their relation to the State. It pays them, it promotes them, it gives them—or withholds from them—social and official honors and dignities.

Their countrymen, Nietzsche, has prophetically dealt with this situation:

"The State has never any concern with truth, but only with the truth useful to it, or, rather, with anything that is useful to it, be it truth, half-truth, or error. A coalition between State and philosophy has only meaning when the latter can promise to be unconditionally useful to the State, to put its well-being higher than truth. It would certainly be a noble thing for the State to have truth as a paid servant; but it knows well enough that it is the essence of truth to be paid nothing and serve nothing." (See pp. 277-81.)

But in view of the persistent and extraordinary efforts being made by the Germans to influence public opinion in America, it seems worth while to consider further, and at some length, the question of the credibility of their official and semi-official statements.

It should be said, at the outset, that it is almost ludicrous, when one comes to read carefully the arguments on behalf of Germany with which this country is being flooded, to note the constant contradictions. There is apparently no statement made by any one of them that is not traversed or denied by another of them.

Two of these missionaries in this cultureless land—Dernburg, the avowed emissary from Germany, and Münsterberg, the type of the pro-German professor, who has made his home here—have been peculiarly unfortunate, as their differences go to the very root and foundation of the war. To be sure, all their fellows pooh-pooh Bernhardt now; they all represent his books as having been without influence; they say that they were not read in America, and that almost no one reads them in Germany. They admit, with reluctance, that he did write books, but they adopt the old method of minimizing guilt, hallowed by the young female in the pages of "Midshipman Easy," by describing his editions as "very little ones." He has a fatal fascination for some of them, however, and even while repudiating him, they often show themselves his disciples.

Münsterberg has been more successful than most in evading him, but Dernburg has been unable, while denying his influence and representative character, to avoid defending his teachings.

Powys says: (126)

"The success of the German campaign of anti-Allies propaganda has been less marked than its energy and patriotism

deserve. The cause of this lack of success is to be found in the fact that the leading German propagandists in this country have chosen to adopt diametrically opposite points of view, points of view that answer one another. For instance, Dr. Dernburg's reply to Lord Bryce's war-statement, whether it refuted Bryce or not, manages completely to dispose of Professor Münsterberg.

"Münsterberg, . . . discussing Treitschke and Bernhardi as 'hashish-dreamers' and 'courageous clowns,' adopts an idealistic, innocent-aggrieved tone; calling attention to Germany's 'pacific and industrious population,' with its one wish, to 'develop its agricultural, and industrial, its cultural and moral resources.' Dr. Dernburg, however, is less inclined to cater so smoothly to American public opinion. He appears to have a simpler, more direct mind than the professor, and to be more inclined to go honestly to the root of the matter.

"For instance, in an article, published in *The Sun*, Dr. Dernburg, although he firmly declares that he holds Lord Bryce wrong in connecting the German people with Bernhardi, yet makes it quite plain that he thinks there is a great deal to be said for Bernhardi's attitude. The greater part of his article is indeed nothing more or less than an explanation of Bernhardi's position and a justification of it."

Later Mr. Powys returns to the same subject:

"Münsterberg adopted the line, more timid and less honest, of making a special appeal to the American people by representing Germany as content with her present position, her position of cultural and industrial development, and in no way anxious to alter it. Bernhardi has converted the German people, has converted Dr. Dernburg, to the absolute necessity of altering it, if Germany as a nation is to survive. Thus Bernhardi's grand dictum of 'world-domination or downfall' becomes intelligible; becomes in fact Germany's motto in this war, and the motive-power behind the heroism and resolution of the German people. . . .

"How ridiculous is it, then, of Professor Münsterberg to endeavor to slip gracefully into the mold of American public opinion, by finding the sole cause of the war in the expansion

of Russia! Certainly one of the causes of the war is the expansion of Russia, but a more direct and powerful cause is the expansion of Germany; an expansion concerning which Dr. Dernburg is, as he says, an answerable authority, 'because I have stood in it.' (127)

These differences of the German apologists themselves are among the most instructive incidents of the war, and have had undoubted effect upon the formation of American public opinion. It is not only that their statements are so frequently at variance with the facts, but their failure to agree with one another ranges from very serious to very trivial matters; from instances like Dr. Dernburg's versions of Germany's attitude toward the Monroe Doctrine, compared with Germany's official statement of her attitude, (p. 93) to others like the question of the proper translation and significance of "Deutschland über Alles." (p. 282)

It is right that these differences, big and little, should, whenever possible, be brought to public notice, and should be emphasized. Making the fullest possible allowance for the fallibility of human testimony, they seem to me to show, not a desire to inform, or legitimately and logically to convince the American people, but rather, at any cost of veracity, or of close adherence to facts, to hoodwink and to mislead them. Naturally, misstatements, exaggerations, suppressions of vital data, and downright falsehoods, cannot be made to agree without more careful consultation than there has been time or opportunity for. In addition to disagreement among themselves, it is noteworthy, too, that the same writer is, on occasion, self-contradictory.

Furthermore they, practically without exception, fail to understand the controversial value of an understatement. They write so vigorously to solicit the sympathy of Americans that they overpass the boundaries, not only of credibility, but also those of sobriety. A laugh evoked by an

argument, intended to be serious and concerned with intensely tragic events, is the most conclusive possible evidence of failure. They all claim too much. If they would claim less, we might believe more. If they did not white-wash so vigorously, we should not suspect so much dirt.

Let me cite, with comment, two conspicuous examples.

Herr Heinrich Friedrich Albert has contributed to the December issue of the *Atlantic Monthly* a paper on "German Methods of Conducting the War," which is more touchingly rose-colored than anything even Doctor Dernberg has written. War, so conducted, far from resembling Hell, is a pretty close approach to Heaven. The Prussian soldier, as painted by Herr Albert, is what old-fashioned people used to call "too good for earth." Shelley's apostrophe to Emilia Viviani,

"Seraph of Heaven! too gentle to be human,"

is the only description which can be found to fit him.

Of course all charges of cruelty are swept aside as of "psychopathic origin." Herr Albert wastes no time on them, but proceeds at once to make clear to us the benignant nature of Zeppelins and airships, which are far more "humane" than artillery, and which, by compelling the speedy surrender of a fortress, "may spare many thousands of lives and property of incalculable value." Even when the bombs are dropped upon cities not under siege "a calm and judicious consideration" will soften our prejudice against them. They were never intended, for example, to destroy life in Paris. "The bombs were meant for the wireless station on the Eiffel Tower." If the inconspicuous nature of the tower concealed it from observation, the blame, we presume, rests with the French, who should have built it higher.

As for the burning of Louvain, Herr Albert clears the invading troops of all responsibility, and practically of all participation in the deed. He does not even admit, with those delightful German professors who put forth their appeal "To the Civilized World," that German soldiers "with aching hearts were obliged to fire a part of the town,"—a purely academic view of militarism. Herr Albert's soldiers behaved better than that. All they tried to do (and who can blame them?) was to defend themselves against the furious attack of Louvain civilians. When, "during this fighting, fires broke out which spread with terrific speed over the city," they risked their lives to rescue the Tower Hall, and "works of art endangered by the flames." All this time the Louvainners, indifferent to the fate of their city, fired "incessantly" at the brave men engaged in the work of preservation. "Unfortunately it was not found possible to save the valuable library of the University."

What a picture of magnanimity! Nothing like it in history. Nothing much like it in fiction. Why not accept the simpler statement of a patriotic German editor who announced that the Belgians, instigated by the English, burned Louvain, in order to "foul the fair fame of Germany."

The levying of indemnities is another point "much misunderstood." The practice seems at first sight an unkind one, and there are some troublesome Hague regulations which, if respected, would spoil all a conqueror's sport. But Herr Albert assures us that these huge sums are demanded "to discourage sniping, and for the administration of occupied territory." They are in the nature of ordinary taxes. True, no dollar of them has been wasted so far in feeding the starving, or sheltering the homeless Belgians. This evidently does not come within the province of practical administration. But if Belgians starve, the fault

(and this we never should have suspected) lies at the door of England. "There seem to be plans under consideration by the German Government to feed the Belgian population by importing food stuffs," says Herr Albert vaguely; and these nebulous plans are in danger of being frustrated by England's wicked efforts to seize such food stuffs as contraband of war. How can kind-hearted Germany feed innocent Belgium when England stays her hand?

The destruction of the Cathedral of Rheims is the episode which of all others we have least understood, and this is because we were, many of us, ignorant of the amazing circumstance which made such destruction "a military necessity." We are ignorant no longer. A German official report, quoted at length by Herr Albert, states that the Commander-in-Chief gave orders to spare the Cathedral, "so long as the enemy refrained from using it to his advantage." The French, thinking to profit by such forbearance, despatched "a military observer" to the roof. This observer, unlike the Eiffel Tower, was visible from afar. "It was necessary to dislodge him," and by the time he was dislodged—though the firing then ceased instantly—the cathedral was in ruins. It sounds like a locomotive running over an ant. The roof—with that tendency to spontaneous combustion which marks the propinquity of German troops—"burst into flames," but "the responsibility rests with the enemy, who attempted to misuse a monument of architectural art under the protection of the white flag." (p. 296)

So far the report. Then follows a priceless sentence of Herr Albert's very own. "For a German, the fact that an official communication is issued by the army headquarters is proof sufficient of its absolute truth to facts." This is sublime. It reminds us of nothing but Prester John expatiating on the qualities of his countrymen. "No vice is

tolerated in our midst, and with us no one lies." (128)

Another excellent sample (of the pleas with which Germany is flooding this country) is found in the article entitled, "Germany's Answer" (129), by Professor Delbrück. The author is Professor of History in the University of Berlin, and is, therefore, Treitschke's successor. To a careless or an uninformed reader the article might seem strongly and almost convincingly to justify Germany's course. But a little critical examination would soon dispel this view.

As Miss Repplier did me the honor of consulting me with reference to a letter she later sent to an American magazine (130) in reply to Professor Delbrück's paper, and as our views absolutely coincide, I shall let her speak for me: "This," she says,

"should be of value to American readers as embodying those ideals made familiar to us by Professor Treitschke and General von Bernhardt—ideals which soft-spoken Germans have endeavored to persuade us are without influence in Berlin. It should also be of interest to American readers as illustrating on a large scale the difference between a statement and a fact. It is a series of assumptions proffered as though they were proven. We are asked to base our judgment, not on what has occurred, which we know; but on what might have occurred, of which we know nothing; not on things done, which are called evidence; but on things surmised, which have no legal or logical existence.

"Professor Delbrück is not soft-spoken. Let me hasten to do him that justice. He says distinctly that Austria cannot 'tolerate the existence of the Greater Servian idea either within its borders or on its frontiers'; that 'it was inconceivable Austria should content herself with the punishment of the assassins and their accomplices, even on the largest scale'; and that 'the only acceptable redress for the murder of the Archducal pair was to put an end once and for all to the Greater Servian aspirations,' to demand terms which would put Servia under Austria's 'permanent control.'

"This is plain speaking. We may or we may not agree with it. We may or we may not think that three millions of people should be robbed of their national life because a shameful murder was committed at Serajevo, with the possible—but unproven—connivance of Servian officials. Things which are 'inconceivable' to Professor Delbrück are perfectly conceivable to his readers. The amazing, and amusing, statement made by this amazing, and at times amusing, German is that Austria's ultimatum (the most bullying document of recorded history) was born of 'dire extremity,' and was sent in the interest of peace. 'Studied politeness,' he affirms, would have fed Serbia's swollen pride, and might have beguiled the Czar into threats from which he 'could not draw back.' After which powerful and conclusive argument, the writer adds serenely: 'We have seen that if Austria had made her demands less sharp, sooner or later the war would have broken out just the same.'

"'We'—the readers—have seen nothing of the kind. We have heard, but we have not seen. We have read, but we do not of necessity believe. Professor Delbrück tells us that England refused in this great crisis to act 'as honor dictated,' she 'suppressed all regard for the common welfare of European civilization.' He assures us that Russia represents 'the most pernicious despotism that the world knows.' But when Germany accuses other nations of despotism and dishonor, we are forcibly reminded of that famous passage in 'The Fortunes of Nigel' (unknown we fear to Berlin professors), where 'Baby Charles' lays down the guilt of dissimulation, and 'Steenie' lectures on the turpitude of incontinence. Russia is despotic. We used to call her cruel. But Germany's campaign in Belgium has forever altered our standards of despotism and cruelty. Before its blackness the Slavic sins grow pale. It is a blot which can never be effaced from the escutcheon of the civilized world. It has made the very name of civilization ring like a mockery in our ears.

"In defence of this campaign Professor Delbrück marshals his most inconclusive arguments. In defence of this campaign Germany will be kept busy arguing until the end of time. Only a good cause can sustain itself without props. Why tell us that the conduct of the German Emperor, the Chancellor, the General Staff, 'all very sagacious personages,' 'cannot be logically explained, unless they were sure that, not only would

England join the ranks of our enemies under any circumstances, but that the united Allies would themselves afterward make their way through Belgium'? Is this considered to be evidence? Can we prove an asserted fact by offering it as an explanation for somebody's conduct. A robs B. A's behaviour cannot be 'logically explained,' unless he were sure that C meant to rob him. Therefore C is to blame.

The plain truth remains that England did not violate Belgium's neutrality, and Germany did; that France did not march her armies across Belgium's frontier and Germany did; that France promised to respect the treaty she had signed, and Germany refused to give such a promise. How can we argue on the basis of what might have happened, and what has happened? The one like paternity, is a matter of conjecture; the other, like maternity, is a matter of fact. And when Professor Delbrück asks us proudly, can we credit his 'sagacious personages' with a blunder; we answer humbly and truthfully that we can.

"As for the naïve regret that Germany found it impossible to secure both the moral advantages which would have been hers had she kept her plighted word and the material advantages which accrued to her from breaking it, this is expressed with Teutonic simplicity. So, too, is the confident assurance that Belgium violated her own neutrality, which is now the rallying cry of German apologists. Because a little nation, weak, but not blind, entertained reasonable misgivings, and planned, to the best of her ability, to defend herself, should these misgivings prove well-founded, she is now accused of being the original aggressor in the quarrel of muddying the water when the wolf came down to drink. Why, asks Professor Delbrück triumphantly had Belgium built her forts on the German, and not on the French border? 'Is a country lying between two unfriendly neighbors, and taking military precaution against the one of them, and not against the other, in reality neutral'?

"Two unfriendly neighbors!' It is candid in Professor Delbrück to admit Germany's unfriendliness; but he has no warrant in assigning the same attitude to France. Belgium saw the Germanic strategic railway, with its admirable equipment, built to her frontier. Had she neglected to fortify that frontier, she would have been criminally improvident. When

an armed house-breaker plants a ladder against our front wall, we do not run and barricade the back windows.

"The final paragraph of 'Germany's Answer' invites a final word of comment. 'We, in Germany,' says Professor Delbrück, 'have the firm conviction that it is not for our own independence alone that we are fighting in this war, but for the preservation of the culture and freedom of all peoples.'

"This is more than the world asks at the Kaiser's hand. Most nations prefer to look after their own culture and freedom in the fashion which suits them best. And if the present condition of Belgium, starved, outraged, broken on the wheel, is a sample of the culture and freedom which are Germany's gift, we Americans pray Heaven to preserve us in ignorance and slavery.'"

The material for continuing this comparison of the statements of German apologists with the truth, or with the statements of other German apologists, is so abundant that it is difficult to make a selection. Dr. Dernburg has been one of the most prolific contributors. We have already seen how he has dealt with the violation of Belgium neutrality (pp. 78-83) and incidentally with the speech of the German Chancellor." (p. 80)

It seems useful to follow this indefatigable agent on another of the trails he has made since his arrival here. He appeared before the American public in December as the triumphant expounder of the so-called "secret papers" found at Brussels. He had the impudence to call our attention to "the guilt of the Belgium Government," and to the "crime" of Belgium. I have elsewhere discussed this, and have quoted American editorial utterances on the subject. But two other of our papers have dealt with him and his scandalous misrepresentations in a way that brings out certain new points in more detail. One (131) said editorially:

"We have both the text of the so-called 'secret treaties' said to have been found in the archives of the Belgian General Staff after the German occupation of Brussels and the interpretation put upon the documents by the Kaiser's ingenious spokesmen in this country.

"The existence of the secret papers discovered in Belgium has long been heralded and public curiosity on all sides has awaited with some eagerness the appearance of the exact text. . . . An examination of the 'secret papers' reveals something which Dr. Dernburg may possibly not have discovered, and which, as we understand the case, radically affects the significance of the documents in question. Dr. Dernburg says:

"'Only the prompt action at Liège that put this important railway center commanding the railway connections to France and Germany into German hands prevented the English landing and invading Belgium.'

"'The guilt of the Belgian Government (!!) in this matter consists in making and concerting plans with the English and French Governments as to what steps to take in case of war.'

"'While Belgium pretended neutrality and friendship toward Germany, it was secretly planning for her defeat in a war which was considered unavoidable.'

"'The Imperial Chancellor has declared that there was irrefutable proof that if Germany did not march through Belgium her enemies would. This proof, as now being produced, is of the strongest character. So the Chancellor was right in appealing to the law of necessity, although he had to regret that it violated international law.'

"A rough summary of the Belgian papers now made public might easily, without dishonest intent on the part of the compiler, give the impression that as far back as 1906 there was a confidential understanding between the Belgian General Staff and the British (and also with the French) military authorities for concerted action in the event of a European war; for joint mobilization; for the prompt employment of the Belgian railways to introduce English and perhaps French troops into Belgian territory, and for the general conduct of a co-operative movement against Germany. This would mean a secret plan, Belgium's 'crime,' as Dr. Dernburg calls it, to prostitute her neutrality to British invasion in order to anticipate a possible violation of neutrality from the German frontier.

"The same idea might be produced in an impartial mind by a hasty or not very critical reading of the documents now published; particularly of Major-General Ducarme's confidential report to the Belgian Minister of War in 1906, concerning a conference with the British military attaché at Brussels.

"There is, however, buried in the text of this confidential report one sentence which does not seem to have impressed Dr. Dernburg greatly. We quote it now, in italics:

"He [Lieutenant-Colonel Barnardiston] proceeded in the following sense: The landing of the English troops would take place at the French coast in the vicinity of Dunkirk and Calais so as to hasten their movements as much as possible. *The entry of the English in Belgium would only take place after the violation of our neutrality by Germany.* A landing in Antwerp would take much more time, because larger transports would be needed and because, on the other hand, the safety would be less complete."

"This certainly puts a somewhat different aspect on the alleged 'criminal' intentions of Belgium. Instead of plotting for concerted action with England and France to procure the violation of her own neutrality in anticipation of Germany's movements, Belgium appears as providing for support in case of invasion by Germany; a purpose on the part of her powerful neighbor even then, as it seems, expected or suspected at Brussels.

"And that is precisely what did happen in and to Belgium."

Dr. Dernburg attempted to defend himself (132) saying that he "did not at all overlook that sentence in the 1906 document that English troops are only to be landed in case of a German attack. He adds: "I mention it where I refer to the fact that in 1906 it had only been a concerted action. The main point is that in the 1912 document there is no such qualification any more." (sic.)

This flimsy excuse is dealt with as follows: (133)

"Dr. Dernburg's interpretation of the conversations in 1906 between the Belgian General Ducarme and the British military attaché, Lieutenant-Colonel Barnardiston, was this:

"They [the so-called secret papers] show that these conversations were also held with Belgium; that the plans had been concerted to invade Belgium with an army of 100,000 men by way of three French ports—viz., Dunkirk, Calais and Boulogne—and that the British plans even considered a landing by way of the Scheldt, thus violating also the Dutch neutrality.

"The documents, giving all the details as translated and showing that Belgian railway cars were to be sent to the named French ports in order to transport the British troops into Belgium, are dated from 1906."

"Let us put the case simply and fairly. These 'secret papers' have been widely advertised as affording evidence of a long concluded plot and purpose on the part of France or England, or both together, to violate Belgium's neutrality in order to reach and attack Germany, Belgium being a party to the plot. This has frequently been alleged by Germany's spokesmen in justification of Germany's actual violation of Belgium's neutral territory in order to reach the French frontier and attack France.

"There was absolutely nothing in Dr. Dernburg's remarks introducing the 'secret documents to give any idea of their significance different from that just stated. He said:

"The Imperial Chancellor has declared that there was irrefutable proof that if Germany did not march through Belgium her enemies would. This proof, as now being produced, is of the strongest character.

"Yet the 'secret' memorandum of 1906, as *The Sun* has pointed out, conclusively shows, in one sentence to which Dr. Dernburg failed to refer in any intelligible manner, that the purpose of the military understanding between Belgium and England was not to walk over Belgium's neutrality for the purpose of attacking Germany, but to help defend Belgium's neutrality and prevent Germany from walking over it in order to attack France. The sentence in question is this:

"The entry of the English in Belgium would only take place after the violation of our neutrality by Germany.

"This seems to settle the question of the intention of England's conversations with Belgium both in 1906 and in 1912. There is absolutely nothing in the second 'secret' document, presumably of 1912, indicating any purpose to attack Germany

through Belgium except in case of a prior invasion of Belgium by Germany.

"Unfortunately Dr. Dernburg failed to point out this most important passage of any of the documents. He left it for *The Sun* to remedy his oversight. The estimable controversialist now says:

" 'I did not at all overlook that sentence in the 1906 document that English troops were only to be landed in case of a German attack. I mention it when I refer to the fact that in 1906 it had only been a concerted action.'

"We cannot do less, in the spirit of fairness, than to reproduce the paragraph in which Dr. Dernburg says he 'mentions' that which we have accused him of overlooking. Here it is. The ingenious reader may occupy himself in hunting for the 'mention':

" 'The position of England was therefore that while in 1906 they had already concerted plans for a joint action, in 1912 England intended action in any case, should a European conflagration break out.'

"We find nothing more definite than this in the way of mention of the central fact. To add to our bewilderment over the workings of a mind in many respects both candid and acute Dr. Dernburg now adds this to his specifications of provocative behavior on the part of 'criminal' Belgium:

" 'A breach of neutrality in the case of Belgium is shown by the repeated use of the term "allies" or "allied forces," meaning Belgium, France and England.'

"Hypothetically allies, hypothetically allied forces, in case of military co-operation to resist a German invasion. Does Dr. Dernburg really expect the American people to believe that he believes that the use of the words in this sense constituted a 'breach of neutrality' on Belgium's part, an offence against Germany justifying the punishment which Germany has—not hypothetically, but in awful reality—visited upon that unhappy nation?"

Another influential paper (134) wrote, after the appearance of the documents in question:

" 'We now let these Belgian documents speak for themselves'

is the concluding sentence of Dr. Dernburg's plea in justification of Germany's violation of her treaty obligations. And they *do* speak for themselves; but they do not speak for Dr. Dernburg. That gentleman, in the course of his 1,500 words, more or less, of introduction, has not a word to spare for the simple fact that the military arrangements discussed between a representative of the British army and a representative of the Belgian army related solely to what would be done 'in case Belgium should be attacked.' Special pleading, on the part of the official advocates of any belligerent, is to be expected; but there are limits beyond which special pleading becomes an insult to intelligence. Those limits are passed when the consideration of measures to be taken by one country in case a treaty is violated by another is deliberately declared to be proof that the first country herself was determined to commit the violation. And on no better basis than this does Dr. Dernburg rest the defence of Germany's crime against Belgium."

Again, Dr. Dernburg tries to exculpate himself by another letter, saying: "You find fault because you think I suppressed the sentence that English intervention was only to take place in case of a German breach of neutrality. This phrase is only in the 1906 document, and I said so."

The reply was as follows: (135)

"Dr. Dernburg, it is true, printed the document **correctly**, but did not himself 'say' anything about the critical sentence. He must be aware that, whatever the true interpretation of the conversation of Colonel Bridges in 1912, it was not binding on his Government. What the understanding of that Government was is made perfectly clear by the explicit statement of Sir Edward Grey in 1913. We print it here in full:

(Copy of a dispatch from Sir E. Grey to H. M. Minister at Brussels.)

"Foreign Office, April 7, 1913.

"Sir: In speaking to the Belgian Minister to-day I said, speaking unofficially, that it had been brought to my knowledge that there was apprehension in Belgium lest we should be the

first to violate Belgian neutrality. I did not think that this apprehension could have come from a British source. The Belgian Minister informed me that there had been talk in a British source, which he could not name, of the landing of troops in Belgium by Great Britain in order to anticipate a possible dispatch of German troops through Belgium to France. I said that I was sure that this Government would not be the first to violate the neutrality of Belgium, and I did not believe that any British Government would be the first to do so, nor would public opinion here ever approve of it. What we had to consider—and it was a somewhat embarrassing question—was what it would be desirable and necessary for us, as one of the guarantors of Belgian neutrality, to do if Belgian neutrality was violated by any Power. For us to be the first to violate it and to send troops into Belgium would be to give Germany, for instance, justification for sending troops into Belgium also. What we desired in the case of Belgium, as in that of other neutral countries, was that their neutrality should be respected, and as long as it was not violated by any other Power we should certainly not send troops ourselves into their territory.—
I am, &c.,
‘E. GREY.’

“It is certain that if England would not violate Belgian neutrality *first*, she would not do it at all, unless Germany set the example. Moreover, we would remind Dr. Dernburg that it is love’s labor lost to argue in the United States about what Great Britain *might* have done, so long as we know what Germany *did* do. Her action was described by her own Chancellor as a violation of international law, and a breach of a solemn treaty. All the documents that may be dug up in the Belgian archives cannot rail the seal off that bond.

“In his next study of ‘Belgian documents’ we hope that Dr. Dernburg will give us his exegesis of two that stand side by side in the Belgian official publication. On August 2 the Belgian Minister for Foreign Affairs asked the German Minister in Brussels if Belgium could still rely upon the former German official assurances that Belgian territory would not be invaded. Herr von Below said that ‘we knew his personal opinion as to the feelings of security which we had the right to entertain towards our eastern neighbors.’ Yet on the same day the same German Minister presented his demand that German troops be permitted to pass through Belgium, with the threat that, if

permission was refused, 'Germany will be compelled to consider Belgium as an enemy'!"

Before leaving this phase of the Belgian question, it is well to note the admirable illustration it affords of the capacity for mutual contradiction and self-contradiction of the German apologists.

At the end of an editorial satirically entitled, "News About Belgium," a daily paper (136) remarked:

"Upon the main question of the violation of Belgium, a correspondent offers a very illuminating summary of the explanations and justifications offered. With his help we classify the pleas as follows:

"The Imperial Chancellor—We committed a wrong, but necessity knows no law.

"Count von Bernstorff—French aviators had flown over Belgium.

"German Professors—Another crime of English hypocrisy.

"Professor Burgess, of Columbia—Belgium had outgrown the 'baby food' of neutrality guarantees.

"Judge Grosscup—The neutrality treaty was not binding as a contractual obligation.

"Professor Sloane, of Princeton—There never was a treaty.

"Doctor Dernburg—Belgium violated her own neutrality.

"Ex-Governor Pennypacker—She stood in the middle of the street (i.e., in the way of traffic).

"Maximilian Harden—Our critics can all go to h——.

"We find all of these more or less interesting, but we are frank to say that the last seems to us the least offensive of the lot."

It might have added: Dernburg (later), Belgian neutrality expired in May, 1872.

Henschel (a New York lawyer). The Treaty (of 1839) had "lost moral validity."

There will doubtless be others forthcoming. But it is all too late. The world, with the evidence before it, has de-

cided. The jury of civilization has brought in its verdict. The court unfortunately lacks, for the moment, the physical power to enforce its decree. But it will sanction no appeal. The moral stigma will remain until the crime has been followed by full expiation, and, if such expiation is involuntary, the stain will be indelible.

But once more, in spite of unavoidable repetition, I want to make clear to Americans the best current American opinion upon this subject. My own arguments may not reach minds which would be open to another line of thought and expression. I may emphasize facts that to certain readers would seem unimportant and overlook others that to them would be conclusive. For that reason I give space to the editorial expression of an American paper (137), which presents the entire question for American consideration. It was headed "A New and More Wicked Assault on Belgium."

"During the splendid outpouring of Philadelphia's generosity in behalf of famine-stricken Belgium we received a letter—anonymous, of course—bitterly denouncing this newspaper's editorial attitude on the war. Only one paragraph was worthy of preservation, because it struck a new note. Said the writer:

"Why print all that slush about the Belgians, when you know, in spite of English lies, that they got what they deserved? If they are hungry, it is because they joined with Germany's enemies. . . ."

"At the time we regarded this singular utterance as a mere manifestation of rancor, due, in part, to the continued ill success of the German armies. But we have learned since that it was a symptom of one of the most remarkable changes of thought that have taken place since the war began.

"Three months ago the German attitude toward Belgium, despite the sanguinary struggle, was marked by a certain formal chivalry. It was 'necessary,' according to the military code, to use the most ruthless methods of warfare; but these measures were adopted, it was said, with regret, and Belgium's

heroic stand for her national integrity, while a costly mistake, was acknowledged to be just. The fullest possible reparation was publicly pledged by the imperial chancellor.

"When it became clear, however, that Belgian resistance had wrecked the plan for a swift conquest of France, and particularly when the German retreat from Paris became a definite fact, there was a marked change.

"Belgium was denounced as an unscrupulous enemy, a nation unworthy of any fate but to be subjugated by brute force. A deliberate campaign was undertaken not only to discredit her self-sacrificing patriotism, but to blacken her fame in the eyes of the world.

"The German government has supplied the keynote for this chorus of defamation by issuing official statements charging that the Belgian government conspired with Great Britain to land British troops in Belgium in 1906 and with France to admit her forces to attack Germany. All the spokesmen for 'Kultur,' from Dr. Bernhard Dernburg to the industrious writers of letters to the newspapers, ring the changes upon this theme with ever-increasing virulence.

" 'Belgian neutrality was a myth,' says one. 'It was one sided, a threat against Germany,' says another. 'Belgium wanted war; she was a secret ally of England and France,' cries a third. German newspapers jeeringly ask why those two countries do not feed the victims of their 'perfidy.' They denounce Belgium as a dishonorable foe, that has earned the utmost rigors of humiliating conquest. With astounding hardihood, the representatives of imperialism now picture prostrate Belgium as the aggressor, and Germany as the victim of cruel injury.

"This propaganda is so widespread and so determined that there is no doubt of its official inspiration. With characteristic efficiency, the German government and people have set out to destroy the image of heroism and sacrifice that exists in the minds of men, and to substitute therefor an image of craft and dishonor.

"Germany is not yet through with crushed and bleeding Belgium. The flinging of bombs on sleeping homes, the leveling of cities, the exaction of vast tribute, the infliction of alien military rule, the driving of a million men and women and children into exile, the seizure of all food supplies from a desti-

tute people—these things are not enough. Belgium's martyrdom must be mocked; she must be covered with reproach; she must be branded, in all her helplessness and despair, as a strumpet among the nations.

"In the face of this campaign of calumny it becomes necessary to restate the facts. Happily, the records are plain, and are not to be obscured or distorted by all the sophistries of eloquent advocates. With as little editorial comment as possible we shall set down once more the record which in its main points is familiar to Americans.

"During the Middle Ages and until the early part of the nineteenth century Belgium was the battlefield of all the contending nations of central Europe, and a dozen times the country was divided, reunited and passed from one alien rule to another. It was held at various times by Burgundy, by Austria, by Spain, by Austria again, and by France. After the fall of Napoleon it was incorporated with Holland.

"The union was intensely unpopular, and in 1830 the Belgians won their independence by revolution. Thereupon 'perpetual neutrality' was imposed upon Belgium, not only by her own desire, but by formal treaty of Great Britain, France, Austria, Prussia and Russia. On June 26, 1831, these Powers signed a treaty providing:

"'Belgium shall form a perpetually neutral State. The five Powers guarantee her that perpetual neutrality, as well as the integrity and inviolability of her territory.

"'By just reciprocity Belgium shall be held to observe this same neutrality toward all the other States, and to make no attack on their tranquility, whilst always preserving the right to defend herself against any foreign aggression.'

"The guarantee of neutrality was distinct and unequivocal, as was the obligation of Belgium to observe the condition. But eight years later the solemn pact was renewed. Holland then for the first time recognized Belgium's independence, and a new treaty between the two countries was signed on January 23, 1839, providing:

"'Belgium shall form an independent and perpetually neutral State. She is obligated to preserve this neutrality against all the other States.'

"Here was stated in still clearer terms the duty of Belgium

not only to observe neutrality, but to 'preserve' it—to defend it. And once more the treaty was placed under the solemn, formal guarantee of Britain, France, Austria, Prussia and Russia.

"Belgian neutrality, in the joint keeping of herself and of the great Powers, was not seriously questioned for more than thirty years. The Franco-Prussian war of 1870 raised the first fears; but Great Britain procured from each of the belligerents a formal engagement not to trespass upon Belgian territory. Moreover, the Belgian minister in Berlin obtained this positive assurance from Bismarck, reaffirming the old treaties:

"BERLIN, July 22, 1870.—In confirmation of my verbal assurances, I have the honor to give in writing a declaration which, in view of the treaties in force, is quite superfluous, that the Confederation of the North and its allies will respect the neutrality of Belgium, on the understanding, of course, that it is respected by the other belligerents."

"Belgium herself was so scrupulously careful in observing her obligations that she forbade her people to supply arms and ammunition to either belligerent, as they had a legal right to do; and she further refused to permit France even to send her wounded troops homeward across Belgian territory.

"The first assault upon her neutrality was made by Germany, one of the signatories to the treaties of 1831 and 1839. On August 2d last, without the slightest warning, she delivered to Belgium an ultimatum demanding passage for her armies across Belgium in order to attack France.

"This, which would have made Belgium an ally of Germany against France, and would have been an utter betrayal by Belgium of her obligations to preserve neutrality, was described by Germany as 'an attitude of friendly neutrality.' The alternative she offered was war, followed by annexation.

"Belgium's reply, destined to become one of the noted documents of history, refuted the invention that France was preparing to invade her territory, and said:

"Moreover, if the country's neutrality should be violated by France, Belgium would fulfill her international duties, and her army would oppose a most vigorous resistance to the invader.

"The treaties of 1839, confirmed by the treaties of 1870, perpetuate Belgium's independence and neutrality under the guarantee of the Powers, and especially under the guarantee of the government of his majesty the king of Prussia (the Kaiser).

"Belgium has always faithfully observed her international obligations; she has fulfilled her duties in a spirit of loyal impartiality; she has neglected no opportunity to maintain her neutrality and to cause it to be respected by others.

"The attack upon her independence with which Germany menaces her is a flagrant violation of the law of nations. The Belgian government, by accepting the propositions mentioned, would sacrifice its national honor and betray at the same time its duty toward Europe. Conscious of the rôle which Belgium has played for more than eighty years in the civilized world, it refuses to believe that its independence can be preserved only at the price of a betrayal of its neutrality.' . . .

"Those who are now defaming Belgium as a plotter against Germany make two allegations. The first is that used by the chancellor—that 'France was ready to invade Belgium.' The utter mendacity of this plea is shown by two facts. First, France offered five army corps to Belgium to defend her neutrality, after the German ultimatum had been given, but Belgium answered:

"We are sincerely grateful to the French government for offering eventual support. In the actual circumstances, however, we do not propose to appeal to the guarantee of the Powers.'

"Second, it is a matter of record that France was so little prepared to invade Belgium that it took her more than ten days to get her troops into the country.

"The other defense offered by the German government is that in 1906 military representatives of the British government tentatively discussed with the Belgian authorities arrangements for landing a British expedition in Belgium in case her neutrality should be attacked.

"If such action was taken, of course it reflects credit upon both governments; for it shows that Britain was ready to make sacrifices to defend the neutrality she had sworn to uphold, while Germany was ready to repudiate her solemn word in order to violate that neutrality.

"And how well prepared Germany was for her perfidious action is revealed in the existence of elaborate railway lines traversing the sparsely populated territory near the Belgian border, with immense yards at the very frontier designed for the handling of troop trains and no other purpose whatsoever.

"The invasion of Belgium was not an enterprise suddenly forced upon Germany by any menace from France or England. It was an act long before calculated and prepared for with deliberate purpose and minute efficiency.

"In the face of this record, German advocates express plaintive surprise that throughout the world there is much hostility to their cause. The fact is that when the imperial troops crossed the Belgian frontier Germany placed herself morally in the position of an international burglar—a measure which would seem to require an extreme skill to justify.

"To a certain extent, the desperate nature of the expedient was mitigated by the straightforward expressions of regret and pledges of reparation. But now these have been repudiated; and Germany is engaged in an organized campaign to defame the victim she wronged.

"This is an offense far blacker than the invasion. Struck down under the plea of 'military necessity,' Belgium is to be robbed even of her good name. The very corpse of the murdered nation is to be dishonored and mutilated."

With this admirable summary the case of Belgium may be dismissed, except for one eleventh-hour addition. On March 23, 1915, appears in the American papers the following statement from King Albert of Belgium, made to a representative of the "New York World":

"No one in Belgium ever gave the name of Anglo-Belgian conventions to the letter of General Ducarme to the Minister of War detailing the entirely informal conversations with the British military attaché, but I was so desirous of avoiding even the semblance of anything that might be construed as unneutral that *I had the matters of which it is now sought to make so much communicated to the German military attaché in Brussels. When the Germans went through our archives they knew exactly what they would find, and all their present surprise and indignation are assumed.*"

I venture to say, that if there is a conflict of testimony as to this matter, America will accept the word of King Albert.

It has been obvious in this country that the utter failure of "Truth About Germany" and other manifestos issued by "learned men," and by German university professors, to influence American opinion has been regarded with irritated amazement by the German sympathizers.

They expected an American public to receive unquestioningly statements handed down from a presumably lofty intellectual altitude. They disregarded the American characteristic of "wanting to know." Even the discovery that the formal appeals were based on sophisms, half-truths and actual falsehoods did not quite satisfy American curiosity.

There still remained to be explained the circumstance that men who should be the reliable guides of the people, the standard-bearers of civilization, the expounders of international morals, could descend to the petty, illogical, evasive and untruthful endeavours which they have made, to bolster up a criminal cause and support a national ideal subversive of all ethical principles.

The explanations have been many in number, but identical in content. The following editorial (138) is selected for quotation partly by reason of its clearness and conciseness, but also because its culminating argument is taken from the writings of the present Professor of Philosophy at the University of Berlin.

"An explanation of the extraordinary zeal with which numerous eminent German professors have attempted to justify the course of their government in the great European war is to be found in the peculiar relations that exist between the university and the state in Germany—relations which are radically different from those that prevail in the United States. In the

eighteenth century German universities were state institutions, the purpose of which was mainly, if not solely, the training of officials for public service. Gradually, during the nineteenth century, the state control over internal affairs in the universities relaxed, while the field of activity and the intellectual scope of these institutions broadened. The general governmental supervision, however, became more rather than less strict, until at the present time the control which the state exercises over the universities may fairly be called rigid. Professors in German universities are, in fact, state officials, appointed, paid, and subject to discipline by the state. The fact that their salaries are supplemented by fees from those who attend certain lectures does not alter this well-recognized relation.

"In the Kingdom of Prussia a particularly close relationship between the government and the universities has been established and firmly maintained; the sovereign himself appoints the full professors, the Minister of Education the assistant or, as the Germans prefer to call them, the extraordinary professors. The faculties may suggest the names of candidates, but the appointing power is at liberty to accept or reject these suggestions. Recent efforts to establish in Hamburg and in Frankfurt universities that should be free from the control of the state have been summarily suppressed; the Prussian Government has no intention of loosening its grip upon these useful institutions.

"It follows from these conditions that a professor in a German university, being virtually a state official, occupies an enviable position of high dignity and of exceptional importance in the community. If the town in which the university is situated is comparatively small, as with Göttingen, Bonn, Heidelberg, or Würzburg, the position of a professor is all the more exalted. In all probability nobody, however rich he may be, can outrank him; and what this means to a people who value rank and titles as do the Germans need not be dwelt upon. University professors in Germany, in truth, form one of the leading classes in the intellectual aristocracy of the empire. With the clergy, the judges, and other civil officials, the physicians and technologists, all, or practically all, university bred, they constitute a kind of official nobility. Only one thing—a commission in the army or navy—can relieve a man from the

necessity of having an academic education if he would be a member of this high order.

"These professors wield an enormous influence in shaping the character and in molding the opinions of the German people. By what subtle but effective means the state controls and regulates this influence whenever the occasion seems to require the exercise of such control was set forth by J. H. Morgan, Professor of International Law in the University of London, in a recent issue of the *London Times*:

"In no country is the control of the government over the universities so strong; nowhere is it so vigilant as in Germany. Political favor may make or mar an academic career; the complaisant professor is decorated, the contumacious is cashiered. German academic history is full of examples. Treitschke, Sybel, even Mommsen, all felt the weight of royal displeasure at one period or another. The present Emperor vetoed the award of the Verdun prize to Sybel because in his history of Prussian policy he had exalted Bismarck at the expense of the Hohenzollerns, and he threatened to close the archives to Treitschke. Even Mommsen had at one time to learn the steepness of alien stairs. On the other hand, no government recognizes so readily the value of a professor who is docile—he is of more value than many Pomeranian grenadiers. Bismarck invited Treitschke to accompany the army of Sadowa as a writer of military bulletins, and both he and Sybel were, after due caution, commissioned to write those apologetics of Prussian policy which are classics of their kind."

"If, however, this evidence is in a measure discredited on account of its source, no such charge of prejudice will lie against Dr. Friedrich Paulsen, Professor of Philosophy in the University of Berlin. In his book on 'German Universities,' in which the large freedom of learning and of teaching is emphasized, Professor Paulsen had this to say of the influences to which professors in German universities are subjected: 'Originally confined to political and military circles, the decorations, titles, and patents of nobility began to invade the academic world in the eighteenth century, and have multiplied to such an alarming extent during the nineteenth that they are almost in danger of losing their distinction.' Professor Paulsen thinks that there would have been no loss to the universities if these distinctions had been restricted to their original sphere—the

diplomatic, political, and military world. The real object for which not infrequently they are bestowed is revealed in what he says later:

"Or is it, perhaps, the purpose of these distinctions to encourage professors to achieve political merit also? In that case the question would arise whether such a thing was compatible with their real vocation. In my judgment this question cannot be answered in the affirmative. If the problem is to acquire the freest and most impartial knowledge of the truth, and to lead others in the same direction, then, it seems to me, there can be no doubt that participation in politics and deferent regard for the views which the political powers happen to consider allowable or necessary will not enhance but will rather diminish the professor's capacity to realize this end. Even though the services of scholars who possess the public esteem may occasionally be desired by the political powers, it will be better for the academic world and the ideal peculiar to it if they be not rendered.'

"Professor Paulsen does not seem to have much faith that the practice of bestowing these distinctions upon university professors will be stopped, for he closes the discussion of the subject with the somewhat cynical observation: 'Governments will not be wanting in future which are ready to offer such rewards for services performed, nor will there be a dearth of hands stretched out to receive them.'

"In the light of the foregoing is it to be wondered at that the professors in German universities are firm in the conviction that right as well as might is on the side of the Kaiser."

If we go back a step farther in the analysis of motives for the extraordinary and surprising alignment of the German "Intellectuals" on the side of wrong, we would find, I think, that one idea is common to them, to the Prussian autocrats and bureaucrats who control them, and to the German-American propagandists who more or less blindly follow them. It is the idea which, based on the theory that war is a "biological necessity," leads logically to the conclusion reached by Major-General von Disfurth

(p. 42) that any act committed in the carrying on of war is "a brave act and fully justified." This dictum would obviously include any means adopted either to win sympathy that would be useful to Germany, or to make trouble for unsympathetic "neutrals," and thus lessen the chances of their harming Germany. Having reached this point even a "learned man" might not find it difficult to regard sophisms, half-truths, or absolute falsehoods as "patriotic" expedients, analogous to the deceptions practiced by a military spy in the service of his country.

Dr. Prince, in the paper already quoted from (p. 108), says forcibly as to this aspect of the matter:

"One word regarding the so-called 'Intellectuals': Are we not compelled to believe it is owing to the unconscious influence of the German viewpoint that a large number of German university professors and others distinguished in literature, science and learning, men of great personal probity and culture and hitherto commanding the respect of the intellectual world, have, in their aim to tell us 'The Truth about Germany' in that and other publications, sacrificed their intellectual honesty to the cause of the fatherland?

"Are we not compelled to believe that it is from the German viewpoint that these intellectuals and, still more flagrantly, the organized political propagandists in this country, represented in the press by Dr. Dernburg, Dr. von Mach, Dr. Albert, Dr. Münsterburg and Mr. Ridder, all of whom we are glad to respect for their culture in other fields, have misrepresented facts of common knowledge relating to the causes of and responsibility for this war—have perverted the meaning of official dispatches and actions and motives of the governments of England and France and Belgium and Italy and Russia, and have sought, by the shallowest sophistries, to throw dust in the eyes of the public and gain the sympathy of the American people?

"If one wishes to recall to mind examples, one need only think of the audacious assertion of the propagandists that Germany offered to make a new treaty with England to guarantee the neutrality of Belgium and that England refused—a reckless

assertion without a single scrap of authoritative evidence; the sophistical assertion that England and France had already violated the neutrality of Belgium before Germany did; that England and France intended to invade Belgium, thus forcing Germany to do so; the disingenuous argument and misrepresentation that Belgium had forfeited its own neutrality before the war; that England claimed to declare war solely because of her treaty with Belgium without regard to her obligations to France; that England wished for war and did not try to prevent it; the disingenuous claim that Germany strove to hold back Austria and maintain peace, and many other statements similar in kind.

"By their publications the propagandists have been successful to a certain psychological and political extent; to a psychological extent in that they have undoubtedly presented to those who were already national sympathizers with the fatherland, to those who have the will to believe, a point of view by which they can justify to themselves, in spite of the facts, their belief in the justice of Germany's cause; to a political extent in that they have produced a solidarity among those who have the will to believe.

"But to neutral Americans, the publicists, the diplomats, the historians, the jurists, the men of American universities, and the "man-in-the-street," who without previous affiliations and without previous national prejudices have studied for themselves the facts as revealed in the official publications of the belligerent nations, all this prostitution of intellectual honesty must be destined to be useless."

A minor and amusing instance of the lack of harmony among German apologists, who strive to pay attention even to trifles—if the trifles are supposed to influence American opinion—occurs in relation to the now famous German song, "Deutschland über Alles." Dr. Dernburg translates the first line correctly, we believe—as "Germany above Everything." Doctor Jastrow (139) translates it "Above Everything else, Germany," which, except for the pleonastic "else," coincides with Dernburg's version. But Pro-

fessor Schuetze, of Chicago (140), bitterly berates Mr. Galsworthy, a distinguished Englishman, for translating the same line, "Germany Above Everything." Professor Schuetze says that this transforms it into a "jingo slogan," and that the real meaning is: "Germany, Germany, dear to me above all things." That may be Professor Schuetze's meaning when he sings "Deutschland über Alles," but that it is implicit in the line itself can scarcely be maintained. Moreover, when Doctor Dernburg and Doctor Jastrow sing it, they are obviously taking the "jingo slogan" view of its significance,—and then the Dernburg, Jastrow and Galsworthy translations are identical! Is it possible that, to the German mind, Dernburg and Jastrow are right, and Galsworthy wrong? It may be so. For eight long months the mental processes not only of the warriors, heroes, and War Lords of Germany, but also those of her statesmen, philosophers and theologians, have been the subject of unadmiring astonishment to the rest of the civilized world. But it should be noted, before dismissing the subject, that George Haven Putnam says (141) that, while in the past "Deutschland über Alles" has been simply an expression of patriotic devotion; "under the war spirit, which has developed steadily since 1871 up to the outbreak in August, 1914, the term, "Deutschland über Alles" has (and very naturally) come to express the present war spirit of the Fatherland, a war spirit which, as openly avowed, is connected with the necessity of breaking up the British Empire.

Professor Schuetze should turn his attention, while he is on the subject of mistranslations, to Doctor Dernburg's rendering into English—again for the benefit of Americans—of the succeeding line of the same stanza. The "Schutz und Trutze," for which "her sons ever stand united," Doctor Dernburg translates: "Defense and Protection." Is

there the slightest authority for softening "Trutze" into "protection"? Would not "Defense and Defiance" be more in accord with both the root significance and the actual everyday meaning of "Trutze"? Is not, for example, a "Trutz-und Schutz-Bündniss" an "offensive and defensive alliance"? There could be no valid objection to Germany's singing about this, but why try to deceive us as to the meaning of her song?

Is it possible that the more accurate translation did not sufficiently harmonize with Dr. Dernburg's description of "Deutschland über Alles" as a "song of modesty"?

One may indeed be defiant when on the defensive, and even Modesty, when outraged, may not only "blush like scarlet" but also have "defiance in her eye." But the picture of a shy, shrinking, blushing Germany singing "Deutschland über Alles" as, armed to the teeth, she desolates Belgium; or even as, more peaceably, she practices the goose-step in the presence of her generals and field-marschals, seems to have elements of psychological confusion. Possibly Professor Münsterberg will help us.

The fact is that a convention of the German and German-American apologists for the purpose of deciding upon authorized versions of German songs and speeches, should be held at once. After that, perhaps, we would not find that the Imperial Chancellor's speech to the Reichstag had been "mistranslated," or that the Chancellor had been "misrepresented," although, by his silence under world-wide criticism, he would seem to have thought himself correctly reported. Nor would we have our Department of State officially announcing that Germany had, in a communication, denied the "intention" to "seek expansion in South America," while Doctor Dernburg transforms the same document into a "solemn declaration . . . fully to respect the Monroe doctrine."

There are at hand many more examples of the contradictory and clumsy attempts of the German protagonists to prepare their output for a supposed American market. On their wares, the customary label, "Made in Germany," might now well be replaced by one reading: "Made for America."

In following this subject of German inconsistencies and German falsehoods further, it seems impossible to ignore Dr. Dernburg. Whenever I think I have finished with him I find something new. He is entitled to head the following summary, even at the risk of repetition. It does not seem right not to call attention to the fact that during his meteoric career in this country he has made the following statements, which may perhaps be most easily contrasted with the facts by means of parallel columns:

THE GERMAN APOLOGISTS.

DERNBURG:

The Treaty of Neutrality expired May, 1872.

"Belgium violated her own neutrality" [in spite of its having already expired].

"The German Government sent . . . a *solemn declaration* to the Department of State that, whatever happened, she would *fully* respect the Monroe Doctrine."

The "secret documents" discovered at Brussels establish the "guilt" of Belgium and her "criminal" intent to break the treaty of neutrality [non-existent according to Dr. Dernburg,

THE TRUTH.

The treaty has been continuously in force since 1839. Belgium obeyed both the letter and the spirit of the treaty in resisting the German invasion.

"The instructions of Germany to von Bernstorff were to deny that Germany *intends* to seek expansion in *South America*" (*U. S. Department of State*).

"Instead of plotting for concerted action with England and France to procure the violation of her own neutrality in anticipation of Germany's movements, Belgium appears as providing

it must be remembered], as shown by "alliances" or by "concerted plans with the English and French Governments."

"Only the prompt action at Liège that put this important railway center, commanding the railway connection to France and Germany into German hands, prevented the English landing and invading Belgium."

"We," *i. e.*, the German Government, "have been able to spend as much as \$250,000,000 a year to take care of our workmen, giving them a compulsory insurance against old age, pensioning widows, and providing for orphans." (143)

"She," Germany, "has waged no war of any kind, has never acquired a territory in all her existence except by treaty and with the consent of the rest of the world. . . . She never

for support in case of invasion by Germany; a purpose on the part of her powerful neighbor even then (1906), as it seems, expected or suspected at Brussels. And that is precisely what did happen in and to Belgium." (142)

"It is impossible to conceive how the taking of Liège 'prevented the English from landing and invading Belgium.' . . . The fact is that Liège was taken a long time before the British troops arrived at Calais, and it is still to-day in the hands of the Germans, without in the least interfering with the arrival of British reinforcements in France." (The Belgian Minister to the United States.)

The employers, not the Government, pay \$14,000,000, the workmen \$125,000,000, and the Government about \$20,000,000, including the expense of the Imperial Insurance office. (144)

History records the annexation of Hanover, the appropriation of Schleswig-Holstein, the German participation in the partition of Poland, the theft of Silesia, the forcible seizure of

was aggressive toward anybody." (145)

"I dare say there were not twenty of the works of any one of these in the hands of Americans outside of clubs and public libraries" before the beginning of the war (attempting to belittle the influence of Bernhardt, Treitschke and Nietzsche). (146)

General Bernhardt "was retired from the service just because his writings and sayings did not meet with the approval of his superiors." Nov. 21, 1914. (147)

Treitschke's "conferences were mainly attended on account of his refined rhetoric." (148)

[In this effort to belittle Treitschke at this juncture Dernburg is joined by Münsterberg, Hilprecht, and other German-American apologists. Ridder says he is "regarded by Germans as a man. . . . who

Alsace and Lorraine, and, recently, the transformation of Belgium into a "glorious German province."

Two booksellers in Philadelphia had sold before the war began nearly five hundred copies of the books of these writers, *i. e.*, about 100 per cent. more than Dernburg asserted to be owned by private individuals in the whole United States.

This statement rests, so far as I know, on Dr. Dernburg's unsupported assertion. He has been publicly asked to prove it. He has not done so. But on March 14th there appears in American papers an article "written by the express permission of the Kaiser," and signed: "Friedrich von Bernhardt, General of Cavalry up to Dec. 31, 1914."

"Treitschke's rôle in all this education for war of the German peoples has been that of the man who has prostituted history in the interests of armament firms. . . . It was Treitschke who really began, even before 1870, the educational campaign of the intellectual class, and he has been its

was incapable of true sympathy with their racial aspirations." (149) Jastrow speaks of him as "a man named Treitschke." (150)

Namur is on the German frontier; Antwerp is at the mouth of the Rhine; Liège controls the landing and entry of the English.

"Deutschland über Alles is a song of modesty," and "Schutz und Trutz" means "Defense and Protection."

"We do not believe in incorporating in our Empire any parts of nations that are not of our own language and race." (152)

"Germany is a 'democracy,' directed by the most liberal ballot law that exists, even more liberal than the one in use in the United States." (153)

most fanatic, as well as its most popular, exponent." (151)

Namur is many miles from the German frontier; Antwerp is many miles from the mouth of the Rhine; Liège has as much to do with the control of the French and Belgian Coast as has Camden, New Jersey.

"Schutz und Trutz" means "Defense and *Offense*."

What of the Poles, the Sile-
sians, the Danes (of Schleswig-
Holstein), the French of Alsace-
Lorraine, the Belgians?

But perhaps he meant to
speak only for the future,
only "When Germany Wins."
(p. 23)

"The Prussian system makes
universal suffrage a farce." (Dr.
Oberholtzer.) (See pp. 148-54)

Just as we have found no misstatement too large or too grave to be employed in the task of deceiving the American people, from the misquotation of a treaty to the re-writing of an Imperial Chancellor's speech, so we further find that

no deception is too petty or too trivial—whether it is a mislocation of a city, or a mistranslation of a song—to be attempted if, thereby, a single pro-German argument can be strengthened, or an anti-German sentiment combated.

But it is not necessary to confine oneself to Dernburg. He must still figure in any investigation into the credibility of the German apologists, as, since his arrival in America—perhaps, as a detail worked out through his country's wonderful "efficiency"—there has been almost complete silence on the part of many who were previously heard from on every street corner. It would almost seem as if he brought with him commands which have been meekly obeyed, even by the formerly vociferous German-American editors and speech-makers, exchange professors, psychologists and archæologists. To be sure the example set them at about the same time by the "learned men" of Germany, in their manifesto to this country (p. 253) must have been strongly deterrent. Their subsequent silence may, therefore, have been merely coincidental with the Dernburg irruption. But I ha'e ma doots! At any rate, I am truly sorry that they stopped. They would have saved some of us—who are inclined to be controversial—much trouble if they had continued, as they were rapidly transforming the original sentiment of the country, which might be described as sympathy for the Allies, with dislike for German aims and methods, into contempt and overpowering repugnance for German aims and methods, with constantly increasing sympathy for the Allies.

Early in the war, *i. e.*, last August and September, most of my friends who thought as I did, described themselves as "pro-Allies." To-day, they are more apt to say they are "anti-German." For this, thanks are largely due to the German and German-American apologists.

The German Ambassador to the United States, Count von Bernstorff, deserves particular, if brief, mention, by reason of his official position.

Bernstorff, in a communication to the State Department, on December 8, 1914, said:

"The Union Metallic Cartridge Company, Bridgeport, Conn., has, on Oct. 20th, secured through Mr. Frank O. Hoagland a patent for a 'mushroom bullet.' It has been ascertained from a reliable source that since October 8,000,000 cartridges, made according to this patent, were sent by the above-mentioned firm to Canada for use in the British Army. No outside sign distinguishes these bullets from ordinary ammunition, so that the soldier who uses them does not know that he is using dumdum bullets."

In reply, the Remington Arms Union Metallic Cartridge Company wrote him under date of December 10th:

"From the date of the original application for the patent up to the date of the second application only 117,470 of these cartridges were manufactured; 8,000 of these are still in stock, and not one has been manufactured since the date the second application was filed; so it is hardly necessary for me to point out how absurd is the statement that we have sold 8,000,000 of them. The cartridge, as above mentioned, is purely a sporting one, used in hunting big game only, and could not be used in any of the military rifles used by any of the foreign powers.

"All of these statements can be substantiated, and we are ready to give you the evidence that you may require on this point. The charge made by you is so serious and your own position as Ambassador is of such conspicuous importance at the present time that we feel it devolves upon you either to retract the charge as publicly as you are said to have made it, or to avail yourself of the right to ascertain the facts for yourself.

"Yours very truly,

"REMINGTON ARMS-UNION METALLIC CARTRIDGE COMPANY,

"S. F. PRYOR,

"Vice-Pres. and Gen. Mgr.

"The British Government has already denied that soft-nosed or dum dum bullets are being used by its troops."

At this writing I have not seen the German Ambassador's reply.

As pertinent to this whole matter of the credibility of the friends of Germany who are seeking to influence American public opinion, I beg to submit in parallel columns extracts from an "Oration" of von Bernstorff's, made before the American Academy of Political and Social Science, on November 9, 1909, and extracts from "The Evolution of Modern Germany," by William Harbutt Dawson, London, T. Fisher Unwin, 1908. The "oration" was innocently copyrighted in 1910 by the American Academy.

BERNSTORFF, 1909:

Impartial students of Germany's position will find themselves confronted by economic facts which alone sufficiently explain why Germany has to turn its attention to the expansion of its influence abroad. (p. 11.)

DAWSON, 1908:

The candid student of Germany's position finds himself confronted by economic facts which alone sufficiently explain why Germany is to-day turning its attention with increasing urgency to the expansion of its influence abroad. (pp. 335-336.)

The question which these facts raise is primarily economic: how will this large population be employed; how will it live? (p. 11.)

The questions which these facts raise are, of course, primarily physical and economic. Where will this large population live; how will it be employed; how will it be fed? (p. 336.)

I cannot but think that if this fundamental fact of Germany's enormous annual increase of population were intelligently grasped, much of the unfortunate polemic to which my country's industrial expansion still gives rise in certain quarters would be moderated. (p. 11.)

One cannot but think that if this fundamental fact of Germany's enormous annual increase of population were intelligently grasped, much of the unfortunate polemic to which that country's industrial expansion still gives rise in certain quarters would be moderated. (p. 338.)

Between a present national ratio of 300 persons per square mile and the ratio of Saxony, Rhineland and Westphalia, there is a difference which represents a population of some forty millions, and within that limit there is clearly a very considerable capacity for expansion. This expansion can, however, only be on industrial and not on agricultural lines.

Between a present national ratio of 300 persons per square mile and the ratio of the West of Prussia there is, however, a difference which represents a population of some forty millions, and within that limit there is clearly a very considerable capacity for expansion. This expansion will, however, be on industrial and not on agricultural lines.

The discoverer of this literary theft (154) gives many references to similar plagiarisms in this oration, not only from Dawson's book, "The Evolution of Modern Germany," but also—by proxy—from Dr. Paul Rohrbach ("Deutschland unter den Weltvölkern"), from whom Mr. Dawson had quoted, with due credit, but who receives "no credit or mention from Count von Bernstorff, his compatriot." Another fellow German, Professor E. Paulsen, is similarly used, word for word, but also without the slightest acknowledgement. The writer adds: "We must contrast Mr. Dawson's moderate and generous treatment of Germany, rising at times to the dignity of chivalry,

with the fashion in which the Ambassador uses the Englishman's material to further his own spiteful innuendo against England. Not only does he annex statements of facts, but he offers as his own Mr. Dawson's carefully argued opinions upon questions of German domestic politics, or else he first uses the original author's words, and then substitutes his own deductions."

And this plagiarist is the person who has undertaken a portion of the self-imposed German duty of instructing this country as to the ethics of "neutrality," and the morals of warfare!

I am sorry that the hope expressed by the chief victim of the piracy, Mr. Dawson, has been shown to be fruitless. Mr. Dawson wrote : (ibid)

"I prefer to leave the matter to public, and especially to literary, opinion, only adding the expression of a hope that the Count's ideas of literary integrity will not be reflected in his further activities either as an exponent of Germany or a critic of British political history and diplomacy."

THE GERMAN APOLOGISTS.

THE GERMAN FOREIGN SECRETARY to the German Ambassador in London, Aug. 4, 1914:

"Please dispel any mistrust that may subsist on the part of the British Government . . . by repeating positively formal assurance that even in the case of armed conflict with Belgium, Germany will, under no pretense whatever, annex Belgian territory."

Dernberg, Nov. 21, 1914: "We have no ambitions of enlarg-

THE TRUTH.

THE KAISER—From an Order to his troops in East Prussia, Nov. 5, 1914:

"Thanks to the valor of my heroes, France has been severely punished. Belgium, which interfered with our attack, has been added to the glorious provinces of Germany." As *The Sun* says (Dec. 30, 1914): "As to the question of the annexation of Belgium by Germany in direct repudiation of the unqualified pledge of August 4, that is

ment in Europe or in America."

a matter still in the lap of the gods."

THE CROWN PRINCE, in an interview with von Wiegand, a United Press staff correspondent, Nov. 20, 1914:

"The English papers have stated that I am a thief and that I have personally robbed and pillaged these French houses in which we have been forced to make our headquarters. Really—and I want you to tell me frankly—is it possible that intelligent people in America can honestly believe such things of me? Can it be possible that they believe me capable of stealing pictures, or art treasures, or permitting the looting of French homes?"

It does seem incredible; but the statement may at least be contrasted with the following extract from a letter to the New York NATION, under date of Oct. 15, 1914:

"During the recent battles of the Marne, the German Crown Prince, in command of his army, passed two nights in the Château de Baye. The state in which his visit left the unique collection of art objects made by the late Baron de Baye during remote explorations of twenty-eight years has been described by the Baroness:

"All the numerous glass cases in a gallery one hundred and fifty feet long were broken and pillaged. Arms and unique jewels and medals have been stolen; precious vases and chiselled gold cups stolen; all the magnificent presents with which the Czar honored M. de Baye in remembrance of his art explorations in Russia, stolen also. In the special museum of 1812, admirable icons, tapestries, miniatures, and the like have been stolen. And souvenirs—the things dearest to the heart—have been taken with the rest. The rarest pieces of furniture and pictures had been boxed up,

with a choice that astonishes in a vandal; but, in the precipitate retreat, the last cases were abandoned.' ”

REV. THOMAS C. HALL, Professor of Christian Ethics at Union Theological Seminary, N. Y.:

“Frederick the Great sent us almost our salvation in Baron Steuben.”

In this statement he seems to have been preceded by Mr. Bartholdt, the same Congressman who has been so active in trying to bring about legislation which would prevent the Allies from receiving supplies from this country. In it also he is followed by Mr. Henschel, of New York, who says, in his pamphlet, “War Hypocrisy Unveiled,” that, “without the militarism of Baron Steuben, ‘made in Germany,’ and the land and naval militarism of France, it is doubtful if the American Colonies would have attained their independence.”

THE SUN (Jan. 21, 1915), deals as follows with the Rev. Thomas C. Hall and the Steuben question:

“That the Rev. Thomas C. Hall, professor of Christian ethics at Union Theological Seminary in this town, should wear his Order of the Crown, third class, with which he was decorated by the Emperor of Germany, with pride is a natural and in no way discreditable circumstance; that he should defend to the best of his ability the present cause of a foreign land to which his affections are bound by strong ties of association is an incident neither extraordinary nor objectionable; but that he should in the defence of Germany and castigation of England misstate the history of his adopted country is at once unnecessary and impudent. Yet Professor Hall is guilty of this when he says:

“‘Frederick the Great sent us almost our salvation in Baron von Steuben.’ ”

The Sun continues by reciting that it had already convicted Bartholdt of this same misstatement by showing that Steuben

came solely at the suggestion and solicitation of the French court and that Frederick the Great had nothing whatever to do with his coming.

It adds:

"That Professor Hall should seek by such means to support his argument is less easily pardoned than was Mr. Bartholdt's transgression. Professor Hall has enjoyed the widest educational advantages. He is an instructor of young men, and he does not hesitate to set himself up as an instructor of the whole country. He has, in his professional capacity, ready access to all the authorities on any subject he discusses. He should be beyond the suspicion of misrepresentation. Particularly, as one who has imbibed at two great universities that German passion for facts of which we hear so much, he should hold such a perversion in intellectual scorn.

"Even had Professor Hall not been influenced by such respectable considerations, why did he not reflect that one such false assertion must inevitably vitiate his whole plea and arouse distrust of even its most violent and abusive passages?"

THE GERMAN APOLOGISTS.

HERE ALBERT (155) "For a German the fact that an official communication is issued by the army headquarters is proof sufficient of its absolute truth to facts."

Lieutenant Wengler, the German officer who directed the shell-fire at Rheims, says: (156)

"The French observer on the

THE TRUTH.

RICHARD HARDING DAVIS has described (157) his two visits to Rheims and summarizes his article in a letter to the *N. Y. Times*: (158)

"May I also, as evidence, tell what I saw? I arrived at the cathedral at 3 o'clock on the afternoon of the day Lieutenant

cathedral was first noticed on September 13. After that, the French artillery-fire became uncomfortably accurate. Eighty shells fell here in one day alone—killing only one cow.

"The fellow continued 'on the job' quite shamelessly until the 18th, when I aimed two shots at the cathedral, and only two. No more were needed to dislodge him. One, from a 15-centimeter howitzer, struck the top of the 'observation-tower'; the other, from a 21-centimeter mortar, hit the roof and set it on fire. I used both howitzers and mortars so as to let the French know that we could shoot well with both kinds. I wanted to dislodge the observer with the least possible damage to the fine old cathedral, and the result shows that it is possible to shoot just as accurately with heavy artillery as with field artillery. The French also had a battery planted about 100 yards from the cathedral. It isn't there any more."

Wengler says he fired two shells, one of which hit the observation-tower and one of which set fire to the roof. Up to the hour of three, howitzer shells had passed through the southern wall of the cathedral, killing two of the German wounded inside, had wrecked the Grand Hôtel, opposite the cathedral, knocked down four houses immediately facing it, and in a dozen places tore up immense holes in the cathedral square. Twenty-four hours after Lieutenant Wengler claims he ceased firing, shells set fire to the roof and utterly wrecked the chapel of the cathedral and the archbishop's palace, which is joined to the cathedral by a yard no wider than Fifth Avenue; and in the direction of the German guns the two shells fired by Lieutenant Wengler had already wrecked all that part of the city surrounding the cathedral for a quarter of a mile. . . .

"'Father,' he says, 'I can not tell a lie. I did it with only two shells.' . . .

"Wengler says the only shells aimed at the cathedral were fired by him on the 18th, and that after that date neither he nor any other officer fired a shot. On the 22nd I was in the cathedral. It was then being shelled. I was with the Abbé Chinot, Gerald Morgan, of this city, Captain Granville Fortescue, of

Washington, and on the steps of the cathedral was Robert Bacon, our ex-Ambassador to France.

"The 'evidence' of Lieutenant Wengler is a question of veracity. It lies between him and these gentlemen. I am content to let it go at that."

DR. LUDWIG FULDA (159)
(*The Fatherland*, N. Y.) says:

"The Cathedral at Rheims has received but slight damage, and would not have been damaged at all had its tower not been misused by the French as an observation station. I would like to see the commander of an army who, for the sake of the safety of a historical monument, would forget the safety of the troops entrusted into his care!"

"In another part of the same article, Dr. Fulda says: 'One should assume that he who has once been unmasked as a liar, therewith should have lost the blind confidence of the impartial in his future assertions.'"

HERR HATZFELDT, Councillor of the German Embassy at Washington, writing ("for the German Ambassador") to Mr. Herbert Welsh of Philadelphia:

"You have apparently a false impression of our political institutions and are not acquainted with the Constitution of the German Empire. Otherwise I

Americans are familiar with the more detailed accounts of the irreparable damage to the ancient church, given separately and independently by Mr. Whitney Warren, Pierre Loti, and Mr. Richard Harding Davis. Dr. Fulda's statement as to the cathedral is demonstrably false; his remark as to liars, I must do him the justice to admit, is quite true. He should be regarded as speaking with the authority of a specialist.

MR. WELSH's reply: (160)

"It is a general impression among our people that, although the German Empire has its Congress, or Reichstag, composed of elected members, who measurably represent the popular will, nevertheless, the dominating voting force of this body really centres in Prussia, and

could hardly understand how you could speak of 'autocracy' or 'purely arbitrary form of government' in Germany. To use your own expression, everybody in our country has 'the right and the habit freely to express himself on public questions.'"

that this section of Germany (an *imperium in imperio*) controls the rest of the empire, and is in turn controlled by the aristocratic military party of which the Kaiser is the resplendent visible head and the actual guiding hand. It is further our impression that he, for ultimate authority, either in the seen or unseen world, looks only to God. . . ."

"But if, in Germany as in these United States, everybody has the right and the habit 'freely to express himself on public questions,' how do you account for the existence and the vigorous enforcement in Germany of laws against *lèse majesté*, under which, as we are informed, persons are frequently punished by imprisonment for spoken or written words critical of, or disrespectful toward, the Emperor? Such freedom of speech in this country is particularly protected by a Constitution, framed by our statesmen of the 18th century, who struggled for constitutional liberties against a British King. He was of German blood and partly by Hessian soldiers he sought to subject his transatlantic colonies to the tyranny of a personal will so autocratic that, as you will remember, it finally ended in madness."

To try to avoid tedium, I may vary this demonstration of the untrustworthiness of these gentlemen by contrasting their statements, not with the facts, but with other statements made by themselves or by their colleagues. I may begin with the most celebrated of all:

IRRECONCILABLE GERMAN STATEMENTS.

VON BETHMANN-HOLLWEG:

August 4, 1914: "Our troops have occupied Luxemburg and perhaps are already on Belgian soil. Gentlemen, that is contrary to the dictates of international law. . . . We were compelled to override the just protest of the Luxemburg and Belgian Governments. . . . The wrong, I speak openly, that we are committing, we will endeavor to make good as soon as our military goal is reached" (speech to the Reichstag).

DERNBURG's version, November 21, 1914:

"What he said was that the neutrality of Belgium could not be respected, and that we were sincerely sorry that Belgium, a country that in fact had nothing to do with the question at issue and might wish to stay neutral, had to be overrun." (161)

VON BETHMANN-HOLLWEG:

August 4, 1914: In conversation with Sir E. Goschen—used the now celebrated phrase, referring to the Belgian neutrality question, about going to war "over a scrap of paper." His obvious meaning was that Great Britain in requiring Germany to respect the neutrality of Belgium, was going to make war just for a word, just for what he regarded as "a scrap of paper" *i. e.*, was making a mountain out of a molehill.

VON BETHMANN-HOLLWEG:

January 20, 1915:

"England drew the sword only because it believed its own interests demanded it. Just for Belgian neutrality it would never have entered the war. That is what I meant when I told Sir William Goschen 'that for England 'the Belgian neutrality treaty had only the value of a scrap of paper';" (162) That is, he (Von Bethmann-Hollweg), now tries to get the American public to believe that he meant the exact opposite of

what he said, and that it was Great Britain who really regarded the neutrality of Belgium as a mere trifle.

VON BETHMANN - HOLLWEG—
Statement to the Americans,
September 2, 1914: (163)

"Contrary to all international law the whole civilian population of Belgium was called out and, after having at first shown friendliness, carried on in the rear of our troops terrible warfare with concealed weapons."

The Kaiser to President Wilson:

"I solemnly protest to you against the way in which this war is being waged by our opponents. . . .

"The Belgian Government has openly incited the civil population to participate in the fighting and has for a long time carefully organized their resistance. The cruelties practised in this guerilla warfare . . . were such that eventually the generals were compelled to adopt the strongest measures to punish the guilty and frighten the blood-thirsty population" (September 4, 1914). See Chapter IV.

Gerhart Hauptmann, to Romain Rolland, October 11, 1914:

A GERMAN MILITARY PROCLAMATION circulated in those parts of the Eastern Prussian Provinces, which were invaded by the Russian Army. November 15, 1914.

"When the enemy crosses the frontiers of Imperial Germany there ensues a struggle of national defence in which all methods are permissible. It is the duty of every man capable of bearing arms to stem the invasion and harass the enemy till he retires. The whole population must take up arms to keep the enemy always in a state of unrest, to seize his ammunition, to stop his food supplies, to capture his scouts, to destroy by any means whatsoever his ambulance and field hospitals, and to shoot him down during the night.

"The men of the Landsturm who perform such duties should not wear uniforms, because by retaining their civilian dress they are less conspicuous and thus are in a better position to attack the enemy unawares." (164) (See p. 488.)

"The peaceful passage of German troops . . . was refused by Belgium.' The Belgium Government then organized an unparalleled guerilla warfare, in order to cover its indefensible position, and by that act . . . struck the terrible key-note of the conflict."
(165)

MÜNSTERBERG:

"The Southern peoples are children of the moment; the Teutonic live in the things which lie beyond the world; in *the infinite and the ineffable.*"

The New York Staats Zeitung, (1905), edited by HERMAN RIDDER:

"One of the most acute and even prophetic criticisms of a Prussian policy which brought about a war imperiling the foundations of society, and shaking even the re-enforced concrete

DELBRÜCK:

"Only to the powerful does power accrue, and in this bid for power lies hidden a deep moral law. That nation which possesses the power of self-control to limit its daily pleasures in order to accumulate national sinews of war; which, to put it crudely, *would rather drink a little less beer and smoke a few less cigars* in order to procure more guns and ships, that nation at the same time acquires the right to assert its individuality and to bequeath the mental assets which it has now for itself in the course of centuries to its one people and to humanity.

New York Staats Zeitung, September 26, 1914. Edited by HERMAN RIDDER:

"Germany has always been a good and just neighbor to Belgium as well as to the other small powers, such as Holland, Denmark and Switzerland, which England in her place

upon which some continental thrones are based, is here submitted:

"If Germany to-day in general is unbeloved, and is able so easily to become suspected, the first and principal reason for this is the provocative activity of the Pan-Germans, their vain-glory and their mania for treating other powers with mortifying insolence. When they complain about the agreement between France and England they should not forget that their unmeasured enmity against Great Britain has driven that country into the arms of France. The Pan-Germans should begin by criticizing themselves. They are a small minority, but they understand how to exert a kind of personal influence over the German people which any day might prove itself in the highest degree fatal.'

"It is all true, every word of it. Events have justified it. It was written by an authority on the subject whose opinion will not be questioned. It may be found in the editorial files of *The New York Staats Zeitung* of nine years ago.

"If those files are not available at the office of that paper, the Library of Congress file is within reach." (166)

would have swallowed up one and all long ago.

"England aims at being mistress of the old world in order to occupy either an equal, or a menacing position toward the new world, as circumstances may dictate. For this purpose she has encouraged this war. The German federated states of Europe are defending themselves with might and main, and are counting in this struggle for existence on the good will of the United States of America, for whose citizens they cherish the friendliest feelings, as they have proved at all times. All Americans who have visited Germany will surely bear witness to that effect."

DERNBURG: (167)

"I do not consider it wise, nor. I believe, do the leading people of my country, for Germany to take any European country."

On pp. 24, 27, 28 will be found summaries of what he, Prof. Hæckel, and Rudolf Martin, ex-Minister of the Interior do "consider wise." It is in direct contradiction of the above statement.

MAXIMILIAN HARDEN, editor of the *Zukunft*:

"From Calais to Antwerp, Flanders, Limburg, Brabant, to behind the line of the Meuse forts—Prussian! . . . The Southern angle with Alsace and Lorraine—and Luxemburg too, if it desires—to be an independent federated state."

"If, 'the spirit back of the war,' must, it will, conquer new provinces for the majesty of the whole German spirit."

"We need land, free roads, into the ocean."

Professor Forel in an open letter to the *Journal de Genève*, addressed to Professor Hæckel, sums up some of the opinions of some of the "leading people" of Dr. Dernburg's country. He says: (168)

"You assert there that it is a necessity to occupy London, to divide Belgium between Germany and Holland, that Germany had to get the Kongo State as well as a great part of the British colonies, the north coast of France, and the Baltic provinces. Your colleagues, Juliusberg, Ostwald, and others, demand moreover that the German Kaiser had to be elected President of the future United States of Europe, and the lead in military matters has to be given entirely into the hands of Germany. Your col-

leagues, Onken and Lenz, treat the small States with the utmost contempt, declaring them to be inferior and parasites, only worthy of annexation."

DERNBURG writes of modern democracies "and especially the German one, which is directed by the most liberal ballot law that exists, even more liberal than the one in use in the United States." (169)

MÜNSTERBERG (170) says:
"There is no room in Germany for a President. The idea of a president is that he draws his power from the will of millions of individuals. The idea of the Emperor is that he is the symbol of the State as a whole, independent of the will of the individuals, and therefore independent of any elections."

VON BETHMANN-HOLLWEG (addressing the American people) —"Belgium plotted with England and France in 1906 to disregard her obligations of neutrality."

HANS DELBRÜCK (addressing the American people):
"Belgium joined the Allies because, when the coalition came (two against seven) 'they considered that side to be the strongest.'"

DERNBURG (August, 1914):
"It deeply distresses us to see two highly civilized nations—England and France—joining the onslaught of autocratic Russia. . . . Russia's attitude alone has forced us to go to war with France and with their great ally." (171)

DERNBURG, (172) November 21, 1914: "England was being outstripped commercially by Germany and therefore 'faced the alternative of . . . being one industrious, less luxurious, and more painstaking—or of fighting. But England was not accustomed to doing her own fighting, save with her fleet. The other fellows . . . could fight her. . . . This is the real expla-

MÜNSTERBERG: "It was the moral right of France to make use of any sort of German embarrassment for recapturing its military glory by a victory of revenge. And it was the moral right of England to exert its energies for keeping control of the seas and for destroying the commercial rivalry of the Germans. No one is to be blamed." (173)

PROFESSOR ADOLPH LASSON: "We are morally and intellectually superior beyond all comparison, as our organizations and our institutions."

DERNBURG: "We have no ambitions of enlargements in Europe or in America." (175)

FIFTY-THREE UNIVERSITIES and THIRTY-TWO HUNDRED PROFESSORS:

"Our belief is that the salvation of the whole *Kultur* of Europe hangs upon the victory which the German militarism will win"

nation of the present war.'" "

"On England alone falls the monstrous guilt and the historical responsibility." Professors Eucken and Hæckel.

MÜNSTERBERG (a little later in the same book), admits that he has "hurled many a reproach against France and England." He thought it inexcusable for them to use the advantage of the hour to join Russia in this fight. He regretted the revengeful feeling of France and the ungenerous attitude of England towards its new rival in the world's markets. (174)

PROFESSOR MORRIS JASTROW, JR.: "The English type of culture represents on the whole, the most harmonious combination of traits of mind and character."

DERNBURG: "When she is victorious there will be enough property of her antagonists lying about the four parts of the globe to keep Germany from the necessity of looking any farther . . ." (176)

DERNBURG: "We have no desire to impose our views upon others. 'We are out for conquest on *peaceful* lines.'"

DERNBURG (address at New Rochelle, U. S. A.): "We Germans love the French and Belgians who were forced into the war."

THE GERMAN PROFESSORS: "The French have shown themselves decadent and without respect for Divine law." "The Belgians, with foolish fanaticism resisted our brave troops."

Lissauer, in "The Chant of Hate": "French and Russian they matter not . . . We love them not, we hate them not."

Dr. Fuchs (in a book on the subject of preparedness for war) says: "Therefore the German claim of the day must be: The family to the front. The state has to follow at first in the school, then in foreign politics. *Education to hate. Education to the estimation of hatred. Organisation of hatred. Education to the desire for hatred. Let us abolish unripe and false shame before brutality and fanaticism.* We must not hesitate to announce: To us is given faith, hope, and hatred, *but hatred is the greatest among them.*"

DERNBURG: "Germany has no special grudge against anybody."

"The Kaiser has conferred the order of the Red Eagle upon Ernst Lissauer, the author of 'Hatred for England,' described by Professor Henderson as a veritable 'war chant of hate,' certainly one of the most venomous poems in any language."

THE KAISER to President Wil-

PROFESSOR LASSON: "We do

son: "Some villages and even the old town of Louvain . . . had to be destroyed for the protection of my troops."

MÜNSTERBERG: "The cause of the war was the desired expansion of Russia."

"As a matter of fact it was not Germany but France who commenced the war."—Eucken and Häckel, Aug. 31.

HANS DELBRÜCK (177) December, 1913:

"National idealism in Germany is in danger of being turned into national fanaticism, and that is the greatest danger that can happen for the health of the soul of any people. . . . The only great danger for the future of the German Empire lies in foreign policy. We might allow ourselves to be drawn into a war which would not only be an unspeakable misfortune for us and for the whole of the cultured world—since it would be unnecessary, but the outcome of which, as things are at present in Europe, is by no means certain. . . .

"Formerly it was possible to console oneself with the thought that the 'All Germans' were a small sect, hardly to be taken seriously, and without influence. To-day that can no longer be said. The All-German Press is widely extended and has a

good deeds to all people. Louvain was not destroyed—only the houses of murderers."

EUCKEN AND HÆCKEL, Aug. 31. "It is England whose fault has extended this war into a world war."

HANS DELBRÜCK (178), March 1915:

"In the United States many have taken sides against Germany because they believed that they saw in the victory of the Western Powers a victory of liberalism, and in a German victory a triumph of militarism. Quite aside from the fact that Germany, in many respects, has far more political liberty than either France or England, the victory of the Allies would be a victory, not of the Western Powers, but of England and Russia. . . .

"Without these tremendous efforts made by Germany, called by our enemies the 'Prussian militarism,' the mainland of Europe would long since have been under the dominion of the Cossacks. . . .

"Therefore, we, in Germany, have the firm conviction that it is not for our own independence alone that we are fighting in

very zealous following. It is not surprising that anxiety at the success of the All-German agitation is widespread."

TWENTY-TWO UNIVERSITIES OF GERMANY:

"It is not true, as our enemies assert, that the German army is a horde of barbarians and a gang of freebooters, who find pleasure in levelling defenceless villages to the earth, and in destroying notable monuments

NINETY-ONE PROFESSORS AND MEN OF SCIENCE:

"Every German would, of course, greatly regret if, in the course of this terrible war, any works of art should be destroyed."

THE KAISER: "We are one people, we know no differences, no distinctions of states or parties."

this war, but for the preservation of the culture and freedom of all peoples."

GENERAL VON DISFURTH: "It is of no consequence whatever if all the monuments ever created, all the pictures ever painted, all the buildings ever erected by the great architects of the world be destroyed, if by their destruction we promoted German's victory." "For my part, I hope that in this war we have merited the title, barbarians."

HERB WOLFSKEHL (poet): "None of us Germans to-day would hesitate to destroy every monument of our holy German past. . . ."

Dr. Lenard (Professor of Physics at Heidelberg) (179):

"The central nest and supreme academy for all hypocrisy in the world, which is on the Thames, must be destroyed if the work is to be done thoroughly. No respect for the tombstones of Shakespeare, Newton and Faraday."

DR. FREDERICK NAUMANN, the leader of the Radicals, but recently a defender of the violation of Belgium, "choose any place in Baden, or Württemberg, or *Bavaria*" (see p. 460) "and let the lieutenants and their

colonel conduct themselves there as they did at Zabern, and you would see what would happen!" (180)

HERB VON JAGOW, Secretary for Foreign Affairs (February, 1915): "England is trying to force upon the German civilian population death by starvation."

Admiral Behrcke: "England has in view the subjugation of Germany by starvation. Germany no longer has sufficient food to feed her people."

GENERAL VON FALKENHAYN, Minister of War and Chief of Staff (Jan. 16, 1915):

"Germany is amply supplied with food. She can fight indefinitely."

Dr. Otto Appel (Feb. 7, 1915): "Germany cannot be starved because . . . of scientific and economic methods to insure food preparedness."

Herr Philip Weincken, Director of the North German Lloyd S. S. Co.:

"The plan of starving us out will miscarry. There is no lack of meat, potatoes, sugar, milk, cheese, or fuel."

HERB ALBERT, to Americans: (181)

"For a German the fact that an official communication is issued by the Army headquarters is proof sufficient of its absolute truth to facts; and the truthfulness of this German official announcement is beginning to be recognized in the United States as well."

MAXIMILIAN HARDEN, to Germans generally: (182)

"Unfortunately there are those who exaggerate small successes till they appear in the eyes of the crowd to be overwhelming victories, and, at the same time, they conceal the heavy losses under the colors. Cease, cease, thus to indulge any longer this detestable habit of misrepresentation."

I think I may at last dismiss this subject—of the credibility of the German apologists—with the feeling that the

unprejudiced reader should be convinced that it would be a compliment to them to call them unreliable. They are so entangled in a network of mutual contradictions, inconsistencies, sophisms, blundering errors, and actual falsehoods, as to have lost all claim to the confidence of the public they are addressing.

The war was begun by Russia. The war was begun by England. The war was begun by France.

We are fighting only for our "place under the sun." We were confined by an "iron band" which we had to burst.

Under no circumstances will we take a foot of Belgian territory. Belgium entire has been annexed to our "glorious provinces."

We violated the treaty of neutrality because of "military necessity." There never was any such treaty. The treaty expired in May, 1872. The French first violated the treaty by flying over Belgium. There was a treaty, but it had lost moral validity. The English were going to violate the treaty. The Belgians had no right to get in the "way of the traffic." Belgium violated her own treaty. Belgium "joined the Allies simply because she considered that side to be the strongest."

Germany has "solemnly declared" that she would respect the Monroe Doctrine everywhere. Germany "intends" to respect the Monroe Doctrine in South America. Germany will respect the Monroe Doctrine in North America. "Canada has placed herself beyond the pale of American protection."

Germany protests against the "barbarity" and "treachery" of ununiformed civilians who shoot at her troops. Germany orders the men of the Landsturm who take up "sniping" to wear civilian clothes so as to be "less conspicuous."

Germany is an ideal democracy. There is no room in

Germany for a president who would have to obtain his power from the consent of millions of individuals.

We are kindly, simple minded and tender-hearted. We hope we have merited the title, barbarians.

We hate no one. We hate England.

We have no ambitions of enlargement. When we conquer we'll find enough property of our antagonists to satisfy us. We'll remain in Belgium and take the strip of coast to Calais.

We revere and respect monuments of art. It makes no difference if every monument in the world were destroyed.

We love the French and Belgians. The French are godless and decadent and the Belgians are foolish fanatics.

The *Kultur* of the world depends on our success. We have no desire to impose our views on any one.

We are "out for conquest on peaceful lines." "Our might shall create a new law in Europe."

Germany is starving. Germany can never be starved.

This, and it could be continued for pages and pages, is, indeed the twitter of birds, the chatter of parrots.

Phillips Brooks' apostrophe to the "Little Town of Bethlehem" might have been addressed to almost any German apologist: "How still we see thee lie."

Let us hope that they are, as it seems to me they are, irreparably damaging their own cause and unconsciously and blunderingly revealing the truth to a world that if it were not horrified would be amused.

Cruelty begets falsehood. The Psalmist recognized the association when he said: "The Lord will abhor the bloody and deceitful man."

But I think we may be at ease.

"Solent mendaces luere poenas malefici."

CHAPTER XII.

What is the Truth as to the "Pre-eminence" of German "Kultur," of German Civilization, of German Achievement in Letters, Arts and Sciences?

"Truth About Germany" was in itself sufficient, considering the representative character of its authors and editors, to raise grave doubts as to the value of German "culture" unless one could be both cultured and untruthful.

The view of culture, as we understand it, in its effect on the individual, is at variance with the result produced by the German variety.

An American of German parentage, writing in defense of his brethren, explains the universal distaste for Germans in Europe by saying: (183)

"The average German, whom the foreigner sees, is aggressive, self-assertive, loud in his manner and talk, inconsiderate, petty, pompous, dictatorial, without humor; in a word, bumptious. He has, in many cases, exceedingly bad table manners and an almost gross enjoyment of his food; and he talks about his ailments and his underwear. His attitude toward women, moreover, is likely to be over-gallant if he knows them a little and not too well, and discourteous or even insolent if he is married to them or does not know them at all. He is at his worst at the time when he is most on exhibition, when he is on his travels or helping other people to travel, as ticket-chopper or customs official." (184)

But much broader views of this subject have been taken by Professor Brander Matthews (185) and by Professor Ramsay:

After expressing his surprise that scholars like Eucken and Hæckel should be possessed of the conviction that Germany is the supreme example of a highly civilized state, and the undisputed leader in the arts and sciences which represent culture, Professor Matthews continues by pointing out that

"Certain things seem to show German 'culture' a little lacking in the social instinct, the desire to make things easy and pleasant for others, an instinct which is the dominating influence in French civilization. . . . It is to the absence of this social instinct, to the inability to understand the attitude of other parties to a discussion, to the unwillingness to appreciate their point of view, that we may ascribe the failure of German diplomacy, a failure which has left her almost without a friend in her hour of need. And success in diplomacy is one of the supreme tests of civilization.

"The claim asserted explicitly or implicitly in behalf of German culture seems to be based on the belief that the Germans are leaders in the arts and in the sciences. So far as the art of war . . . and so far as the art of music are concerned, there is no need to cavil.

"But what about the other and more purely intellectual arts? How many are the contemporary painters and sculptors and architects of Germany who have succeeded in winning the cosmopolitan reputation which has been the reward of a score of the artists of France and of half a dozen of the artists of America?

"When we consider the art of letters we find a similar condition. Germany has had philosophers and historians of high rank; but in pure literature . . . for a period of nearly sixty years—only one German author succeeded in winning a world-wide celebrity—and Heine was a Hebrew, who died in Paris, out of favor with his countrymen, perhaps because he had been unceasing in calling attention to the deficiencies of German culture. . . . No German writer attained to the international fame achieved by Cooper and by Poe, by Walt Whitman and by Mark Twain. And it was during these three-score years of literary aridity in Germany that there was a

superb literary fecundity in Great Britain and in France, and that each of these countries produced at least a score of authors whose names are known throughout the world. Even sparsely settled Scandinavia brought forth a triumvirate, Björnsen, Ibsen and Brandes, without compeers in Germany. And from Russia the fame of Turgenev and of Tolstoy spread abroad a knowledge of the heart and mind of a great people who are denounced by Germans as barbarous."

As Heine is the one German who has been pre-eminent in literature these many years, it is interesting, in view of recent happenings, to recall, as entirely apropos to Professor Matthews' line of thought, what he wrote seventy-eight years ago:

"Christianity—and this is its highest merit—has, in some degree, softened, but it could not destroy, that brutal German joy of battle. When once the taming talisman, the Cross, breaks in two, the savagery of the old fighters, the senseless Berserker fury of which the northern poets sing and say so much, will gush up anew. That talisman is decayed, and the day will come when it will piteously collapse. Then the old stone gods will rise from the silent ruins, and rub the dust of a thousand years from their eyes. Thor, with his giant's hammer, will at last spring up, *and shatter to bits the Gothic cathedrals!*"

Professor Matthews thinks that in the field of science, pure and applied, the defenders of the supremacy of German culture will probably take their last stand. He goes on:

"That the German contribution to science has been important is indisputable; yet it is equally indisputable that the two dominating scientific leaders of the second half of the nineteenth century are Darwin and Pasteur. It is in chemistry that the Germans have been pioneers; yet the greatest of modern chemists is Mendeleef. It was Hertz who made the discovery which

is the foundation of Marconi's invention; but although not a few valuable discoveries are to be credited to the Germans, perhaps almost as many as to either the French or the British, the German contribution in the field of invention, in the practical application of scientific discovery, has been less than that of France, less than that of Great Britain, and less than that of the United States. The Germans contributed little or nothing to the development of the railroad, the steamboat, the automobile, the aeroplane, the telegraph, the telephone, the phonograph, the photograph, the moving picture, the electric light, the sewing machine, and the reaper and binder. Even those dread instruments of war, the revolver and the machine gun, the turreted ship, the torpedo, and the submarine, are not due to the military ardor of the Germans. It would seem as though the Germans had been lacking in the inventiveness which is so marked a feature of our modern civilization. . . .

"Nations are never accepted by other nations at their own valuation; and Germans need not be surprised that we are now astonished to find them asserting their natural self-appreciation, with the apparent expectation that it will pass unchallenged. The world owes a debt to modern Germany beyond all question, but this is far less than the debt owed to England and to France. It would be interesting if some German, speaking with authority, should now be moved to explain to us Americans the reasons which underlie the insistent assertion of the superiority of German civilization. Within the past few weeks we have been forced to gaze at certain of the less pleasant aspects of the German character; and we have been made to see that the militarism of the Germans is in absolute contradiction to the preaching and to the practice of the great Goethe, to whom they proudly point as the ultimate representative of German culture." . . .

He adds finally: "The most obvious characteristic of a highly civilized man is his willingness to keep his word, at whatever cost to himself. For reasons satisfactory to itself Germany broke its pledge to respect the neutrality of Luxemburg and of Belgium. It is another characteristic of civilization to cherish the works of art which have been bequeathed to us by the past. For reasons satisfactory to itself Germany destroyed Louvain, more or less completely. It is a final characteristic of civilized man to be humane and to refrain from ill-treating the blame-

less. For reasons satisfactory to itself Germany dropped bombs in the unbesieged city of Antwerp and caused the death of innocent women and children. Here are three instances where German 'culture' has been tested and found wanting."

Professor William Ramsay (186), whose position in the scientific world is of the very highest, says:

"The originality of the German race has never, in spite of certain brilliant exceptions, been their characteristic; their *métier* has been rather the exploitation of the inventions and discoveries of others; and in this they are conspicuous. . . . The aim of science is the acquisition of knowledge of the unknown; the aim of applied science, the bettering of the lot of the human race. German ideals are infinitely far removed from the conception of the true man of science."

He asks as to the result of the annihilation of the present ruling German despots:

"Will the progress of science be thereby retarded? I think not. The greatest advances in scientific thought have not been made by members of the German race; nor have the earlier applications of science had Germany for their origin. So far as we can see at present, the restriction of the Teutons will relieve the world from a deluge of mediocrity. Much of their previous reputation has been due to Hebrew residents among them; and we may safely trust that race to persist in vitality and intellectual activity."

In his article on "Germany and Democracy" (187) Dr. Dernburg reiterates the old assertion that "Germany stands in the first rank in applied science." In the opinion of many who are technically qualified to judge she is not, and never has been in applied science (the use of science for the improvement of the conditions of human life) the equal of France, England, or the United States. Dernburg specifically instances "chemistry," "electricity," and "med-

icines." In none of these need the claim be admitted, or even considered.

I have already given lists (p. 316) of the chief modern additions to the comforts of peace and the effectiveness of war and have seen that as to practically all of them Germany has been merely the exploiter of the discoveries or inventions of other races.

In medicine, the greatest discovery of modern times—antiseptic surgery—is to be divided between a Frenchman and an Englishman. Anesthesia the world owes to America. All the "medicines" that ever came out of Germany, all the minor discoveries that the most liberal or partial judge could assign to her, could not in a century equal in their benefits to humanity the thousandth part of those due to anesthesia and antiseptis.

Professor Trowbridge, President of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, a physicist of international reputation, says that in physical science—embodying the laws of light, heat, electricity and magnetism,—and in mathematics and physical chemistry, the great names are Roger Bacon, who outlined the principle of the telescope; Francis Bacon, who established the doctrine of inductive reasoning (without which scientific laboratory work would be impossible); Newton, who demonstrated the law of gravitation; Young, who established the undulatory theory of light; Rumford (an Anglo-American), who proved that heat has its equivalent in motion; Faraday, who first liquefied a gas and who with Cavendish and Humphry Davy, discovered the chief fundamental laws relating to electricity.

He might have added that Priestley, the discoverer of oxygen, was an Englishman; Lavoisier, the father of modern chemistry, was a Frenchman; Dalton, the deviser of the atomic theory, was an Englishman; Davy, who first isolated potassium, was an Englishman; Berzelius, who

made analysis an exact science, was a Swede, and so was Scheele. Dumas, one of the most eclectic chemists who ever lived, was a Frenchman; Stas, whose determinations of atomic weights form now the basis of our knowledge, was a Belgian, born in Louvain; Le Blanc, the inventor of the alkali process which bears his name, was a Frenchman; Solvay, who devised the rival process, was a Belgian; Perkin, the discoverer of aniline dyes, was an Englishman; the discoverers of the Periodic Law were Newlands, an Englishman, and Mendeléef, a Russian. (188)

Professor Trowbridge gives still other examples, and adds: "It is a fact that the great physical hypotheses have been Anglo-Saxon in origin, and culture is noticeably lacking in German scientific literature. For clearness of expression and style we must go to the French."

Since Sedan, Germany has fallen into third place in the subjects he mentions, and is led by both England and France. The discovery of the X-rays in Germany was a "fortunate accident," and remained an isolated one, until the English applied it to the theory of radio-activity, firing the faggots which the Germans piled. "Those Americans," adds Professor Trowbridge, "who are loudest in their praise of German culture often argue from an imperfect knowledge of the history of science.

It may be well to hear what two of the greatest Germans, Nietzsche and Goethe, have had to say about German "culture": (189)

"Let us hear Nietzsche: 'Since the war [1870] all is gladness, dignity, and self-consciousness in this merry throng. After the startling successes of German culture, it regards itself not only as approved and sanctioned but almost as sanctified. The units of this caste [the scholar-caste, Professor Münsterberg's caste] are too thoroughly convinced that their own scholarship is the ripest and most perfect fruit of the ages—in fact, of all

ages—to see any necessity for a care of German culture in general. Everywhere, where knowledge and not ability, where information and not art, hold the first rank—everywhere in fact where life bears testimony to the kind of culture extant—there is now only one specific German culture, and this is the culture that is supposed to have conquered France.’ In what sense can German culture be said to have conquered? In none whatsoever; for the moral qualities of severe discipline, of more placid obedience, have nothing in common with culture. Meanwhile let us not forget that in all matters of form we are, and must be, just as dependent upon Paris now as we were before the war, for up to the present there has been no such thing as an original German culture. We ought all to have become aware of this of our own accord. Besides, one of the few who had the right to speak to Germans in terms of reproach publicly drew attention to the fact. ‘We Germans are of yesterday,’ Goethe once said to Eckermann. ‘True, for the last hundred years we have diligently cultivated ourselves, but a few centuries may yet have to run their course before our fellow-countrymen become permeated with sufficient intellectuality and higher culture to have it said of them, *it is a long time since they were barbarians.*’

“What species of men have attained to supremacy in Germany? This species of men I will name—they are the *Philistines of culture*. But Philistinism, despite its systematic organization and power, does not constitute a culture by virtue of its system alone; it does not even constitute an inferior culture, but invariably the reverse—namely, firmly established barbarity. For the uniformity of character which is so apparent in German scholars of to-day is only the result of a conscious or unconscious exclusion and negation of all the artistically productive forms and requirements of a genuine style.”

As to the result of what they call “Kultur” I agree that:

“In so far as German ‘kultur’ was good, it had all the world to dominate, and no objection. In thirty years that domination had made vast progress. But against the domination of the Prussian idea the objection is so vital and intense that in the great world-rising against it there is only too much prospect

that the breath of German 'kultur' will be clean squeezed out of the German body. Krupps cannot do much for it; destruction and extermination—the erasure of beauty, the expulsion of piety—are not aids to it. It should be the ally of those things, not their foe. Alas, then, for German 'kultur,' ridden to its death by the ruthless Prussian demon—struggling splendidly to do the demon's work, but fated, who can doubt, to sink in due time, gasping and bleeding, foundered by that fatal rider. The pity of it; oh, the pity of it; that what should be the world's example must figure as its warning; that this hell that is heating for the Saxons and Bavarians—kindly people both—is the kind of hell that awaits all people who fail to fight off Prussian domination before it has enchained them. It is a bad hell—a hell of Krupps and ruined cities and violated women, and tears and misery and blood, and blackened fanes." (190)

We are told now that we have translated "Kultur" incorrectly that the nearest we have to a synonym in English is not "culture," but "efficiency." Let me present an American view of the workings of German "Kultur"—with the latter meaning—in Belgium. (191)

"Much has been said—but not enough—concerning the marvelous efficiency of the German war machine. The stupendous task of the field—in the transport, commissary and medical departments, as well as in the grim business of fighting—are performed with the same precision and competent energy as distinguish German industrial methods.

"When the reservist is summoned to the colors at his distant home he may know that a careful state has made preparation for everything that may befall him. His uniform is ready, the train to carry him to the front waits; he will find prepared his place in the trenches, his hospital bed if he should be wounded, his Iron Cross if he should prove a hero, his grave diggers if he should fall. Whether his fate be death or glory, efficiency shepherds him to the end.

"But this quality of thoroughness is not exhibited in purely military affairs alone. The most striking evidence of it that we have found appeared last week in two dispatches. Singu-

larly enough, they were printed in adjoining columns on the same day:

**BLACKEST FAMINE
THREATENS BELGIANS.**

ROTTERDAM, Dec. 11. — "If somebody does not come to our aid, God knows what will become of us," write two leading residents of Blankenberghe, West Flanders, in a pathetic appeal they presented to-day to the representative of the American Commission for Relief in Belgium.

These men were deputized to seek help on behalf of Heyst, Wenduyn and several other communities as well as Blankenberghe, in all of which they say "the situation is so grave that if in the near future food does not arrive they will be plunged in blackest famine."

**SEND FRENCH FLOUR
BACK TO GERMANY.**

BERLIN, Dec. 11.—A visitor at the headquarters of one of the German armies in France sends his impressions here. Of all the impressions of the trip one of the most striking is that left by the countless stacks of unthreshed grain, stretching for miles in every direction throughout the granary of northern France.

Over 100 German threshing machines of the largest size are working in the region occupied by the army, and six new ones were encountered to-day plugging forward to reinforce those harvest batteries, which are doing work quite as important as that of the 42-centimeter cannon.

The army is not only living on the supplies of flour and meat derived from this section of the country, but is actually sending wheat and flour back to Germany.

"We venture to say that no more convincing testimony could be given of the efficiency that has made Germany a leader in war as well as in many of the arts of peace—the Belgians starving, while the victorious army strips 'the granary of northern France' of its harvests, feeds itself and sends the surplus home across the conquered territory.

"There has been considerable discussion during the war of the

national ideals of America and Germany. It might be difficult to represent them more accurately than in two contrasting pictures—shiploads of American food pouring into Belgium by way of Holland, while carloads of French grain roll through the famine-haunted land on their way to Germany.

"The two incidents recorded serve to emphasize once more the relentlessly efficient methods employed to insure the submission of Belgium. While the American people have responded with splendid generosity to the appeal of the sufferers, the invaders have never swerved from their businesslike procedure of making the victims pay for their patriotic resistance. On the day when the newspapers printed the two dispatches quoted the Belgian Prime Minister, Baron de Broqueville, made this statement:

"The war levies that have been and are still being made on almost every community in Belgium have exhausted the capital resources of our country, one of the objects of these levies being to cripple and destroy Belgium's commerce and industry.

"The food requisitions relentlessly made upon our communities in all quarters have not only been cruel but excessive, and are in violation of the hitherto universally recognized principles of international law. Famine has so far been prevented only by the food provided through the benign agency of the Commission for Belgian Relief, established and supported by the generosity of American and English people.'

"In the minds of most Americans, we think, the case of Belgium is and must remain the supreme issue of the war, involving, as it does, the common rights of humanity and the fundamental principles of international security. Upon this question, too, the advocates of the German cause lavish their most elaborate defensive arguments. We have yet to find one of them, however, who has attempted to justify the monstrous practice of extorting crushing tribute from conquered and unresisting cities.

"This is a matter upon which we have already expressed ourselves, and perhaps an opinion from another source will be of interest. In its current issue *Collier's Weekly* says:

"'An American newspaper man named Karl H. von Wiegand has had a pleasant interview with Crown Prince Frederick William of Germany. The Kaiser's son denounces the present

struggle as "the most stupid, senseless and unnecessary war of modern times," and then goes on to explain how entirely his own side is justified. We are further assured that, "like a great majority of all Germans, he is unable exactly to understand why there is not more sympathy in the United States for Germany."

"The same papers which reported this precious interview reported also these items: First, that the German government has decided to levy on Belgium a war tax of \$7,000,000 per month; second, that Germany has paid Luxemburg \$318,200 for the violation of her neutrality, passage of troops, etc.; third, that Brand Whitlock reports "the German government renews its official declaration that conditions in Belgium are as represented, and views with great gratification the generous efforts of the American people to relieve the starving population there. Without such assistance there must be famine."

"Now, the American people cannot be expected to sympathize with this hog-and-wolf militarism; to override the weak, plunder the helpless, and rob the miserable to death is no road to our regard. Those who fawn on Frederick William represent him as a young man of intelligence and imagination. Even so he will never understand the bottomless condemnation in which he and his are held in this country, because he will never see or admit the infernal wrongs committed by his fellow-countrymen. The wolf always acquits himself."

"No doubt the severe view here expressed will be shared by many Americans. Yet we think it would be unfair to attribute this admitted official atrocity, the levying of blackmail upon a wronged community, to mere wanton greed on the part of the invaders.

"It is all a question of policy, of national philosophy. Militarism is above all things efficient. It demands absolute, unrelenting efficiency in the supreme business of war. The object of war, it holds, is not only to defeat the enemy, but to crush him, to strip him of any power of reprisal, to paralyze him with punishment and terror, as a warning to himself and to others. If the Belgians can be beggared as well as conquered, it will be so much the longer before they will be able to threaten the rule imposed upon them.

"There is a difference in method, but not in principle, between the 42-centimeter siege gun, the shipments of French grain

through starving Belgium, and the war tribute of \$7,000,000 a month extorted from the famine-burdened nation. Each is a product of efficiency—misapplied."

The claims of America itself have been put forward amusingly by Mr. Vance Thompson (192) in an alleged interview with an American who was said to have just been listening to a discourse on "the debt this country owes to Germany," delivered by a "German professor from Harvard." The interview proceeded as follows:

"Like a good many of us I have spent years in Germany. And I say that we owe less to Germany than to any one of the great nations. We have a far heavier debt to England, France and Italy. And Germany, mark you, has taken from us a thousand times more than she has given us."

"Go on," I said, 'you interest me strangely.'

"Well, just at present Germany is making war. What is she doing it with? With inventions due to Americans."

"And then he named them—Maxim, Holland and the Wrights, the inventors of the rapidfire gun, the submarine and the aeroplane, which latter was invented at a time when all the German scientists were declaring a 'heavier than air' was impossible."

"There you are," he went on, 'even her own game of war Germany has to play in terms of American invention. General von Heeringen, in command of the Western armies, was frank enough to admit a day or two ago that without the automobile, the aeroplane, the telephone and wireless telegraphy Germany would not wage war for twenty-two hours. I think the telephone is an American invention, eh? And the aeroplane. Now the automobile belongs to France and the wireless telegraph to Italy. The boot seems to be on the other foot.'"

"He quoted from Dr. Emil Reich (p. 36), who was, he said, a man of rare mental integrity. And it seems that Doctor Reich pointed out there was nothing quite so foolish as the American imitation of German educational methods, which was common in the last century, saying: 'It is scarcely a matter of doubt that the Americans entertain far too exaggerated an

opinion of the value of German methods and German research in all that applies to the humanities, such as history, philosophy, philology, literature and art.' That was in 1907. It was a dark age in our universities, heavy with German pedantry. That was the day when the unlearned, even in the colleges, spoke of the 'thorough German' and the 'brilliant but superficial Frenchman.'

"As to art," he went on scornfully, 'we don't owe them much on that score—nothing but the bad lessons of the Munich school, which ruined an entire generation of American painters and illustrators.'

"And chemists, you say? There you come home to me. Our American chemists take the lead everywhere except in France—and we are no bad second to the French chemists. Out of the ten million or so Germans in this country I should be surprised if you could find a dozen distinguished chemists. No, the Americans lead.

"What annoys me most of all is the pretension of that professor from Harvard that the Germans have a systematic and scientific way of doing things which should be to us an example and an ideal. That is the greatest absurdity that was ever put into words. The modern and scientific organization of business is as distinctly an American invention as is the reaping machine or the steamboat or the cylinder press or the daily newspaper. We have been the teachers; we have taught every other nation. We've taught them how to manufacture and how to sell and how to total the score on a cash register of American invention, or make out a bill on an American invented typewriter. System? We made it and invented the tools for it. What is to Germany's credit is that she has been one of our aptest pupils in methodizing business and trade, just as the Japanese are our aptest pupils in scientifically organized manufacturing. Now this is known to every practical business man on earth. Even a 'German professor from Harvard' should know it.

"Why?" Mr. Thompson asked; but his interlocutor had no mind for trivialities; he was waving the Stars and Stripes gloriously.

"What did he mean by talking of 'German efficiency' to a nation that first gave the word efficiency a real meaning? As a matter of fact we have invented everything that makes for efficiency, from the sewing machine to the incandescent light

that hangs above it. Certainly we have bought dyestuffs from Germany; but that was because we could buy them cheap; it is not a debt to German civilization. We owe the same sort of thing to Hungary for paprika and to Argentina for leather.

"In 'system' and 'efficiency,' as well as in science and art, we owe the greatest debt to ourselves. The real trouble with the latter-day American is that he is too modest, too credulous, too diffident. That is a sad and certain truth. When a foreign professor hectors him he says meekly: 'Oh, I'll try to be more like you.' By the way, that is one reason why the Americans are so popular in Germany; it is because they admit every claim to German superiority.

"And here," Mr. Thompson continues, "I believe we have come with startling unexpectedness upon a great truth.

"Should you look for the real causes of this war you might find them in the fact that France, England, Russia—even Belgium—have always laughed at these pretensions. I don't say it is the real *causa causans* of the war, but unquestionably it helped to foster the military spirit in Germany. The French wits made fun of everything German—the way the German ate, his beer drinking, the clothes he wore, the hats and dresses of his womenkind; and the English stared coldly at his attempts at sport and his peculiarity of wearing evening dress in the afternoon, at his beard and hair; and truculently the German retorted: 'But, by jingo! I can fight!' He can; and he made his monstrous war machine."

An American weekly (193) has well symbolized intelligent American opinion on the announced intent and the associated effort to spread German "Kultur" to other countries in spite of their lack of admiration for it, their absence of sympathy with it, their contempt for many of its tenets and its manifestations, and their entire unwillingness to receive it or to be inoculated with it.

"In the year of our Lord 623 Mohammed, the son of Abdallah of the tribe of Koreish, began to spread Kultur by the sword. He did not spell it that way, but that is a detail. His energy and his efficiency methods, combined with his outbursts

of hysterical fury, were so prevailing that when he died in 632, in the manly prime of his early sixties, Arabia had been brought under his scepter. His successors carried the great work on. To Palestine, Mesopotamia and Persia, to Egypt, North Africa and Spain, they triumphantly bore their faith in one God and his prophet Mohammed, cheerfully committing all the slaughter dictated by 'military necessity.'

"The 'inferior civilizations' had curious vitality, however, and the efforts of the faithful to turn the Western flank of the Christian allies failed. Partly in consequence of this misfortune, things began to go wrong on the Eastern battle front. The Califate of Bagdad admitted 'reverses' in 1258, and in 1492 the Moors withdrew from Spain to occupy 'more advantageous positions' south of the Strait of Gibraltar.

"Whether because the plans of the Mohammedan General Staff had miscarried, or because of 'weakness' attributable to the acknowledged 'pacificism' of their religion, the small Christian states of Europe developed a prejudice against the practice of propagating culture by militarism. They did not disavow the 'duty to be strong,' and some of them were unkind to heretics, but having only an 'inferior' civilization they associated aggressive war with such material ends as territorial expansion, tribute money, and commercial opportunity. It is doubtful if they clearly visualized the comprehensive relation of bombardment and rapine to the religion of Christ, or fully appreciated the value of reprisals upon non-combatants as a means of grace.

"Yet Europe prospered notwithstanding its irresolution, and civilization, of a kind, made headway. Literature was produced, art showed a degree of vitality, and after a while the progress of physical science rendered possible a somewhat remarkable improvement in the material condition of mankind. All this possibly contributed to spiritual inertia. Ultimately an opinion prevailed that things were going well. In certain quarters, indeed, the notion arose and gained acceptance that war for any purpose or on any pretext was no longer necessary. Day dreamers began to talk of general disarmament and universal peace.

"It was therefore with a measure of surprise that the world awoke in the early days of August last to realize that the virile pragmatism of the son of Abdallah had not in fact gone from

remembrance. It had found lodgment in the dutiful soul of a stalwart folk committed no less than he to the forcible expansion of culture.

"Another surprise, milder but not uninteresting, was forthcoming when the 'intellectuals' of the New Islamism began emotionally to appeal to an infidel world beyond the Rhine to 'understand' them and their 'culture,' and, in particular, to hold their gunners guiltless of wrongdoing. This appeal has seemed to both the lay and the academic mind in America inconsequential, even inconsistent. It is at least perplexing. Islam, so far as we know, never explained or asked to be understood. There is no evidence that it cared what the infidel thought about anything.

"We leave to the experts of international law the question of Germany's technical culpability, and the question of the propriety of action by neutral nations to demand of her an explanation of her conduct as a signatory party to conventions signed by them. The appeal of Germany's intellectuals is to public opinion. As humble contributors to that opinion it is our judgment and verdict, that upon the showing of facts thus far submitted, Germany has reverted to the theory and practice of Islam, and is attempting to spread her 'culture' by the sword."

Under the title, "An Intellectual Moratorium," another American paper (194) has entertainingly reviewed the literature and brought forward some new evidence:

"The German professors having had their say about the war, their colleagues abroad are beginning to react, and the fashionable pastime of the moment among the learned of other nations consists in taking cockshies at German reputations, or, to use the current phrase, 'pricking the bubble of Teutonic pretensions.'

"Since Sir William Ramsay set the example many others have come forward enthusiastically in support of his conclusions. Professor Sayce, the eminent Assyriologist, thinks it 'astonishing that British scholars and politicians should still be found speaking of "our intellectual debt to Germany."' In his own departments of study he admits that the German scholar 'can appropriate other men's discoveries' and 'labori-

ously count syllables and words and pile up volumes of indices'; but beyond that he is fit for nothing but building 'theories which take no regard of facts, though as coming from Germany we are told that they must be regarded as infallible.' In science, philosophy, letters and art—only excepting music—the Germans have been strangely unproductive in comparison with their rivals; in a word, their manifest destiny in the intellectual world is to play the part of 'hewers of wood and drawers of water' for Western Europe.

"Not all of the professors allowed this criticism to pass unchallenged. Professor H. H. Turner objected to the observation that Germany could show none to match a Newton, a Darwin, a Pasteur, etc. In his own departments Professor Sayce, he said, might be right, but 'it ought to be impossible to think of Newton without thinking of Kepler; or of Pasteur without thinking of Koch.' Then came Sir E. Ray Lankester to Professor Sayce's support. He would not attempt to controvert Professor Turner in his own field of astronomy, but must point out his unfortunate mistake—'explained no doubt by the fact that he is not a biologist'—in naming Koch in the same breath with Pasteur. He knew both of them personally, and 'the only way in which one can think of Koch in relation to Pasteur is in recalling the Prussian insolence and discourtesy with which Koch assailed the great Frenchman.' For the rest Koch was an industrious and moderately capable investigator with many zealous and admiring disciples; 'by them—in the usual German way—he was advertised and celebrated beyond his due as a wonderful discoverer.' Huxley, he adds, used frequently to comment 'upon the exaggerated nature of the reputation for learning and scientific capacity which the Germans had created for themselves,' and this unjustified renown he attributes 'to the irresponsible gush of young men who have benefited by the numerous and well-organized laboratories of German universities.'

"The medical men have been quite as industrious as any of the others in exposing the falsity of German pretensions. The opportunity was welcomed especially by Dr. Mercier, the noted psychiatrist, who for years has protested constantly against what he calls the superstition of German pre-eminence, particularly in his own field. But in one department of activity he insists that they surpass all other nations. 'I refer,' he explains, 'to their genius for self-advertisement. They have con-

trived upon a very slender basis of achievement to impress themselves upon the world as the most scientific nation on earth . . . In getting themselves accepted at their own valuation they are immeasurably superior to every known example—even to Mr. Bernard Shaw . . . They display the same adroitness in foisting upon a gullible world their scientific achievements as their shoddy commercial wares, and the two are of much the same value—made for show and not for endurance—in short, made in Germany.' It may be remarked that few who have taken part in the discussion so far have failed to pay a frank tribute to their German rivals on this score."

CHAPTER XIII.

What of Russia in This War, and of the "Slav Peril?"

To many persons in this country the relation of Russia to the cause of the Allies, which those of us who believe in it describe as the cause of true Democracy, has seemed anomalous. The German talk of the "Slav Peril" has had perhaps more weight than any other of the pro-German arguments.

I have nowhere seen a more succinct or satisfactory statement as to this question than that by Mr. James Davenport Whelpley, here subjoined: (195)

"The Slav menace to Europe"—much talk is heard of it and much is written. That there is no such menace has been demonstrated conclusively in the last five months. Such a united resistance as that which Western Europe would present need go no further than an ultimatum, for the East would be helpless in the face of such power and such purpose now, and as surely for several generations to come. With double her present population, Russian armies would be outnumbered and outclassed by the forces of the Western Allies.

"To have a Slav menace for Europe it is necessary to assume, first, that Russia is gazing westward with longing eyes and unsatisfied ambitions; second, that her strength is sufficient to warrant an attempt to satisfy such longing and gratify such ambition. So far as territory to the westward is concerned, Russia is now prepared voluntarily to decrease her holdings in that direction by giving independence to Poland. There are excellent military and economic as well as political reasons for this move. It was to have come about had this war never taken place. Plans were made for Polish independence several years ago, and in the good time of Russia—which is always a long

time—it would have come. The war hurried events and enlarged the plan—that is the only change.

“What Russia proposes to do now if victorious is to force Germany and Austria to add their quota to the new Poland and grant political independence to the whole of this now divided nation instead of only to that part now known as Russian Poland. By doing this Russia would build up a great buffer state between herself and Western Europe, behind which she could, without hindrance, carry on the development of her own vast territory, a work at which a good beginning has already been made.

“There is only one direction in which Russia has ambition to add to the extent of her empire at the present time, and that is toward the Dardanelles. That this passage from the Black Sea to the great waters of all the world is not hers now is the sorrow and exasperation of her people and the wonder of other nations. Heretofore England has stood in her way, but now, with as good grace as may be under the circumstances, British opposition to such a move on the part of Russia will be withdrawn, for it is the one accepted fact concerning any future division of spoils in case the Allies are victorious, that Russia will come into her own in Constantinople.

“A glance at the map reveals the justice of her claim and the economic necessity of such territorial acquisition. The vast Russian Empire now has only one outlet to deep water not ice-bound in the winter months, and that is through the Black Sea; but even here, before the trade routes of the high seas are reached, her ships must pass under the guns of alien forts. The Black Sea is in reality only a Russian harbor, with its entrance commanded by those opposed to the expansion of Russian trade. The stake of the Dardanelles was in itself sufficient to determine the lines of her alliances and tempt her to put her fortune to the test of war.

“There would be no violence done to the people of the Straits were Russia to become their ruler, for they could have no worse or more corrupt government than is now their portion, and the new Lord of the Manor would be only adding a few more thousand believers in the Koran to the millions already under his authority. There would be no violence done to race or religion. If there is a country in the world which has an excuse for waging a war for new territory, it is Russia, for the Straits of

the Dardanelles fall naturally and justifiably within the scope of Russian development.

"If unsuccessful in this war, Russia will retreat within herself, vanquished but unconquered, as she has done before, and will bide her time, which is a longer time than any other nation can bide or endure, and then the sons of those who are fighting to-day will seek the gates to the open waters, to hold them for their own for all time, for in the end the entrance to the Black Sea will inevitably fall into Russian hands.

"This great war is only an incident in the life of this mystical, slumberous and altogether remarkable nation. With others it may mean the end of leadership; not so with Russia, for she has a destiny to work out within the borders of an empire already greater than the world has ever seen—one which will absorb completely the energies of her peoples for many generations to come.

"No, there is no Slav menace to Western Europe; first, because there is no desire to menace; second, because if there were, a human dam could be built across the face of central Europe which would turn back even the flood of Russia's countless armies."

As to the share of Russia in the war itself, in regard to which I have heard much misgiving expressed by Americans with the strongest possible sympathy for the Allies, I prefer to accept the opinion of Mr. Stanley Washburn. (196)

"What I have seen in Poland has been a revelation to me of the armies of New Russia. As regards the organization and efficiency which we who were in Manchuria ten years ago came to know, there is about as much difference between the present military machine that is steadily and surely driving against Germany and that which first crumpled up on the Yalu before the assaults of the Imperial Guards of far-off Nippon as was the difference between the raw recruits that stampeded at the Battle of Bull Run in 1861 and the veterans that received the surrender of Lee at Appomattox four years later. . . .

"Until I went to Poland I had not during this war been

actually in the life of the army itself; of the efficiency of the German army, measured by the terrific blows that it had been striking, we all knew. Of the Russians we know little, save of their Galician campaign. But now at last from the first day we entered the sphere of active and immediate operations we had the chance of forming an opinion as to the soldiers of the Czar—an opinion which in two days became a conviction, and that was that this army had been completely reorganized in ten years and that it was under full steam with a momentum and efficiency which was almost incredible to those that had seen it ten years ago on the dismal plains of Manchuria.

"For weeks there have been suggestions in the foreign press that Russia has been moving slowly, but that her slowness was the preparation for sureness is the answer which one reads on the highways and byways of Poland to-day. . . .

"There is no question about the Russians to-day. When I first came to Russia I wrote a story from Petrograd in which I mentioned the new spirit of Russia and the willingness with which the troops were going to the war. After having been at the front and seen hundreds and thousands of the same soldiers on the roads, in the trenches, and in the hospitals I am of the opinion that what I then wrote is absolutely true. None of these pathetic units in the great game wanted the war, and I suppose every one of them prays for its conclusion, but almost without exception they take it philosophically and as a matter of course. Their hardships and their losses, their privations and their wounds, all are accepted as inevitable. The absolute hopelessness which one saw on their faces in Manchuria is not seen in these days. The keynote of their appearance wherever I have seen them in this war is a good-natured cheerfulness and readiness to accept the necessary in a cause the general nature of which most of them understand. . . .

"The soldiers themselves go on from battlefield to battlefield, from one scene of carnage to another. They see their regiments dwindle to nothing, their officers decimated, three-fourths of their comrades dead or wounded, and yet each night they gather about their bivouacs apparently undisturbed by it all. One sees them on the road the day after one of these desperate fights marching cheerfully along, singing songs and laughing and joking with one another. This is morale and it is of the stuff that victories are made. And of such is the fiber of the Russian

soldier, scattered over these hundreds of miles of front to-day. He exists in millions much as I have described him above. He has abiding faith in his companions, in his officers, and in his cause. I think myself that sooner or later he will win. Time alone can say when his victory will come."

As this book goes to press the fall of Przemyśl, the slow but steady approach of the Allied fleets to Constantinople, the renewed repulses of the Germans in East Prussia, the obstinate, unrelenting Russian campaign in the Carpathians, all seem to give point and significance to the articles I have quoted.

It does look as if a "new Russia" were fighting in this war and as if a Bull Run might again be followed by an Appomattox. Certainly Russia has now made the Eastern winter campaign of the Germans a failure. The "Slav Peril" must seem very real and very threatening to them, but I do not think that the rest of the world has any reason to be disturbed about it.

CHAPTER XIV.

What Are the Duties of America at this Time?

It seems to me a very narrow and indeed a somewhat discreditable view of the *duty* of America at this time, which would confine us to strict "neutrality" in both word and deed. The former is, of course, practically impossible. The habit of saying what we think is too ingrained to be abandoned by reason of a Presidential or any other decree or proclamation. And what many Americans think is that we have ourselves been offended, injured, flouted by Germany's actions, beginning with the violation of the Belgian neutrality.

There is in existence a document to which the United States of America is one of the signatories. Another signer is the German Emperor. This document embodies the results of The Hague Conferences of 1899 and 1907. Mr. James F. Muirhead, of London (197), has discussed in a most interesting manner the situation arising from the existence of this paper. One of its sections, (Convention Concerning the Laws and Customs of War on Land) consists of a recitation of the practices which the signers solemnly undertake to abstain from in the prosecution of a war. Among the provisions in this code are the following:

Undefended towns shall not be bombarded, (Article 25; also Article 1 of Naval Code).

Pillage is expressly prohibited, (Articles 28 and 47).

Illegal contributions must not be levied, (Articles 49 and 52).

Militia and volunteer corps enjoy the rights of belligerents, (Article 1).

The seizure of funds belonging to private persons or local authorities is prohibited, (Articles 46, 53 and 56).

Collective penalties for individual acts are forbidden, (Article 50).

Every effort must be made to spare buildings dedicated to public worship, art, science or charitable purposes, (Article 56).

The terrorization of a country by outrages on its civilian population is forbidden, (Article 46).

It is forbidden to make improper use of a flag of truce, of the national flag, of the military insignia and uniform of the enemy, or of the distinctive signs of the Geneva Convention, (Article 23); and it is forbidden to kill or mutilate the wounded, or to kill and wound by treachery, (Article 23).

The weight of evidence that Germany has flagrantly violated most of these regulations is overwhelming, even if we omit those in the last paragraph as difficult to prove and peculiarly liable to exaggeration. It is not, however, necessary to omit them, in view of the American and German evidence now before the world. (See Chapter IV.)

Mr. Muirhead continues:

"The question, then, seems to arise obviously and inevitably: What is the position in these circumstances of the other signatories to the code?

"The United States of America was not one of the guarantors of the neutrality of Belgium. Hence, whatever may have been the feelings of its citizens, it was not, as a nation or government, legally called on to interfere. True, the action of Germany was a direct attack on the principles of liberty and independent nationality, of which the United States of America is rightly considered as one of the greatest protagonists. But it may be granted that civilization has not yet progressed so far

that intervention on a purely ideal ground can be held to be a matter of practical politics—even for a country with 90,000,000 inhabitants, and wealth beyond the dreams of avarice.

“But unless the ‘scrap of paper’ theory is to be applied indiscriminately to all contracts and treaties between nations, what is the exact meaning of the signatures of other Powers, including the United States, to the decisions of The Hague conference? Do they mean only a promise that the signatory will itself observe those decisions? Or do they go further, and involve the obligation that each signatory State shall, so far as lies in its power, enforce the observance on any signatory that violates them? It cannot be maintained that such an obligation goes so far as to involve undertaking war for the purpose of enforcing observance, but surely it involves *some* effort to procure it. Can a great nation afford to put its name to a document and then stand by in icy neutrality while that document is being torn to shreds by another of the high contracting parties? Is the conduct of Germany in this regard really as much a matter of indifference to the United States of America as to China or Abyssinia? It is obvious that the signature of Germany is worthless, and that the signature of Great Britain is being honored. But has, or has not, the value of that of the United States of America been somewhat impaired? Germany’s word was given to America as much as to England. Can America, then, consonantly with its dignity and honor, allow Germany to snap its fingers at her, and say, ‘Well, what are you going to do about it?’”

Mr. Muirhead asks if the attitude of the United States of America should be, or must be, that of a neutral, equally friendly to both parties and waiting quietly for the chance to insinuate proposals of peace; or if the necessity of the case is not something wider and deeper than can be met by an ordinary peace based on comparatively unimportant mutual concessions? Is it not, he says, inevitably a fight to a finish, and is not the United States of America enormously interested in having that “finish” in one way only?

He expresses the hope that the Allies will need no

material assistance from the United States of America in achieving their ends, but adds:

"Those of us, however, who love America must pray that she will definitely declare herself on the side of popular liberty, if for nothing else than for the preservation of the full measure of our love and admiration."

America was quick to see which was the side of right and justice in the war, but has been slow to awaken (indeed is not yet fully awakened) to its tragic possibilities.

"Questions like the current one, whether the Prussian Idea is the Only Hope and the Kaiser the Preferred Instrument of the Almighty, are, of course, very interesting indeed to discuss, but even to the Prussians themselves the discussion will seem too dear if the price of it is extermination.

"We do not realize this war, we Americans. The people who realize it most, as yet, are the Belgians, but all the countries actively concerned in it will realize in due time what it means when the resources of a mechanical civilization are concentrated on the destruction of human life. As for Belgium, she is like a country crucified for the saving of the nations. Of all the countries involved in the war, she was the most innocent, the best justified, the most gallant. Gashed with innumerable wounds, her poor body is a witness, still living, against the aggressions of Prussia, and against our modern warfare by machinery." (198)

In the early days of the war I was travelling in Alaska and in our Pacific northwest and Canada. I talked with many Americans whom I met on trains or boats or at hotels. I did not find among them a single pro-German. But when I expressed the view, which I then absolutely held, that we—the United States—should help to make the issue of the war certain by promptly offering the Allies every assistance in our power, I found no one to agree with me.

I have noticed since then a steadily increasing and strengthening trend of public opinion in that direction. Now, when I express the same sentiments, nearly every second person acquiesces. Many Americans have publicly put themselves on record as favoring some form of intervention on behalf of the Allies. Some would be content with a protest against the violation of the Hague convention and an expression of opinion that would *officially* declare to the world, what the world already knows, the overwhelming sympathy of this country for the cause and the principles for which the Allies are fighting.

Others, among whom I am to be counted, are in favor of prompt recognition of the fact that for the sake of humanity and of civilization we cannot afford to permit Germany to win, and that the surest way of preventing it is to take sides at once. It seems a terrible thing to advocate war for one's own country when war might be avoided. But it is more terrible to think of the indefinite prolongation of the slaughter now going on and of the experiences now awaiting not only the combatants, but the women and children and babies left homeless and fatherless. If our intervention brought victory to the cause of the Allies a month earlier than it would otherwise come, it would be justified.

I am at one with Mr. Fraley, who, in the article I have twice quoted from (199), said:

"Why not then take a hand at redefining, right now, whilst our action will be effective; saying to the War Lord: 'You have elected to ply your trade on these lines, but the business is at your peril. If you should be so unlucky as to shed American blood upon neutral ground or even in an enemy's territory, at a point remote from battle and without due warning; or if an American should be harmed, in person or property, by a mine of yours upon the high seas; we shall hold it to be an act of war.'

"'Advise' our fellow-neutral, Holland (whose present status is Germany's best asset), that it is contrary to the public policy of the world that Germany should have the benefits of Dutch neutrality for the entrance of supplies, whilst trampling on the obligations of neutrality towards her next door neighbor. Prohibit all shipments from the United States to Holland except upon the guarantee of the Dutch government that they shall not go beyond her border. Exert all our influence upon the public opinion of the world to denounce the War Lord as an enemy of the human race.

"If Germany should resent this, how could we make good?

"Send our Atlantic fleet to co-operate with the Allies in closing the Baltic, and take along, as supply ships and colliers, every German vessel now in our ports. We shall find some of them loaded already.

"What precedent exists for such a notice and demand? The mouth of the War Lord is closed on the subject of precedents, but if we must have a formula to go by, wherein would our action differ, in spirit, from that which we have already done in Cuba and in Mexico?

"We, the great Neutral Power of the World, who desire that all neutrality shall be alike effective and respected, find the situation intolerable. We know that the one hope of stopping wars, is to supply a world wide sanction for the support of international laws and morals."

I believe that to-day this expresses the view of a large and rapidly increasing number of Americans, and that before long the majority of our people will regard it as the duty of the President to protest against the disregard of treaties and the violation of conventions, and to make such protest so emphatic that there can be no doubt left in the minds of the Kaiser and the German people that the sympathies and, if necessary, the support of the United States are pledged to the cause of the Allies.

Since it was written the piratical threat of the "war-zone," the illegal capture and destruction of an American ship, the atrocities and barbarities of the German cam-

paign in Belgium have added to Germany's offenses against civilization in general and against America in particular.

Dr. Charles Eliot, President Emeritus of Harvard, in an address on "America's Duty in Relation to the European War" is quoted as saying: (200)

"With Germany, might made right. She made a violent attack on the weaker, because it was the shortest, the easiest way. What a blow this was to our idea of mercy, to our conception of the progress of man from a barbarian to a civilized, fair, merciful being! We had hoped that the methods of war were capable of amelioration, but this war has blown all those hopes to the winds.

"All our hopes were shattered by Germany's action. All our American ideas of the right to life, liberty, property, happiness, were nullified by this nation, which is led by a ruler who has an archaic idea of his powers and of his relation to the world. Germany has shown us that in the most advanced nation, as far as science is concerned, there is no place for mercy, no place for good will and that hatred takes the place of good motives.

"We must bear in mind the deep obligations which this nation is under to England and France, so deep that it is vain to expect us to be in our hearts neutral. Can we think of giving no aid to France if she comes to the end of her resources; to England if she should be reduced to like straits?

"But let us not confuse our minds by failing to see whither the German policy tends. Let us not dream of abandoning our faith that human relations shall be determined by considerations of justice, mercy, love, and good will. We must help the Allies if our assistance is requested."

To quote the usually pacific *Outlook* (201), and with most cordial approval:

"To a nation that acknowledges no law but its own might, those nations that have a sense of honor and regard their obligations as binding, can only say: 'If only the sword will induce you to keep your word, we shall have to let the sword do its

work. It will be our business to see that the observance of treaties which we regard as a matter of honor, you shall find to be a matter of self-interest.' ”

Professor G. B. Adams, of Yale, is reported (202) to have said recently:

“So much is at stake for civilization in this war that Germany must not be allowed to win it, even if it becomes necessary for the United States to enter the conflict on the side of the Allies. . . . Germany represents in government and institutions an obsolescent system away from which the world has been advancing for generations. . . . Germany must be defeated in this war. If it comes to the point when it is necessary for the United States to aid the Allies to the end that they should win, then I hope it will be done. She is opposed to everything for which we stand, and our turn would be next if Germany were successful.”

Mr. Robert Bacon, ex-Ambassador from the United States to France, says: (203)

“Signs are not wanting that the people of this country are unwilling to submit much longer to the injunction laid upon them that our neutrality should impose upon us silence regarding aspects of the European war with which we have a vital concern. There are many men who consider that this nation is shirking its duty by maintaining a policy which may be interpreted as giving tacit assent to acts involving us morally and much more intimately than has yet been expressed. These men believe that we have a high responsibility in upholding the treaties which were signed at the Second Conference at The Hague in 1907 and ratified by the United States and the nations now at war. . . .

“In The Hague convention referred to we have a real and intimate concern. That convention was signed by the delegates from the United States and ratified by the United States government, and it was signed and ratified by Germany, making it

a treaty between Germany and the United States, in which the other ratifying Powers were joined.

"In admittedly violating Articles I and II of that convention Germany broke a treaty she had solemnly made and entered into with the United States.

"Are we to suffer a nation to break a treaty with us, on whatever pretext, without entering, at least, a formal protest? Will anyone contend that our neutrality imposes silence upon us under such conditions? Are The Hague conventions to become 'scraps of paper' without a single word of protest from this government? If the treaties which we made at The Hague are to be so lightly regarded, then why not all our other treaties? As a matter of fact, it is our solemn duty to protest against a violation of pledges formally entered into between this government and any other government, and we assume a heavy moral responsibility when we remain silent. In this crisis, particularly, other nations look to us and never, perhaps, has our example had greater force."

Professor Henry M. Howe, of Columbia University, has expressed (204) as follows the alternatives open to the United States:

"Are there not two courses now open to us which may direct the course of human affairs for centuries; the first to be neutral, while revictualling and rearming Germany as far as is possible through Holland and Scandinavia, and thereby increasing the chance of her reaching a position in which she can later conquer us and the rest of the planet, and meanwhile force us to become primarily military instead of industrial; the second to join the Allies and prevent Germany reaching that position, not only directly by our strength, but still more by withholding from her those supplies of food, ammunition and gasoline without which she must yield?

"Germany having now disclosed her wish to rule the planet, does she not know that this war will decide either that she shall reach a position in which she can carry out that wish, or that the rest of the world, recognizing this to be her wish, will combine to prevent her in perpetuity from reaching that position?

"And is not this knowledge one sufficient reason for her anxiety for our good will, lest we aid the Allies to prevent her reaching it?

"If we are to have a world alliance for restraining military aggression, should not that alliance be formed now rather than after the subjugation of the Allies shall have left no unsubjugated civilized powers collectively strong enough to restrain Germany? The world's present power to crush the aggressor suffices. If we allow this war to go against the Allies, shall we not thereby lose perhaps the last golden opportunity?

"If our danger seems remote, is not that because we have not given it thought?

"If the great work of the Allies is to prevent Germany becoming irresistible, is not this as necessary to our preservation as to theirs? If so, do not honor and dignity call on us to assume our share in the burden of this prevention?"

The Hague Conventions of 1899 and 1907, with the annexed regulations, were signed by the direction of Colonel Roosevelt, then President of the United States, and expressed the practically unanimous sentiments of our people.

Colonel Roosevelt now writes: (205)

"Most emphatically I would not have permitted such a farce to go through if it had entered my head that this government would not consider itself bound to do all it could to see that the regulations to which it made itself a party were actually observed when the necessity for their observance arose. . . . Of the present neutral powers the United States of America is the most disinterested and the strongest, and should, therefore, bear the main burden of the responsibility in this matter. . . . If they (The Hague Conventions) meant anything, if the United States had a serious purpose, a serious sense of its obligations to world righteousness when it entered into them then its plain duty (after proof of their violation has been obtained) is to take whatever action may be necessary to vindicate the principles of international law set forth in those conventions."

Professor William Gardner Hale, of Chicago, says (206) that as the second Hague Conference dealt with neutral powers everywhere in the world, and as the agreement declared their territory "inviolable," and as this was agreed to by forty-two other powers (in addition to Germany and the United States), Germany's act in breaking the law did not concern England, France, Belgium and herself alone, *it concerned us*. "It was not merely a shameful act toward a brave but weak state, *it was an offence to us*."

Professor Hale continues:

"In a given country there is force to maintain the laws. As between countries, there has been no means. There is, in the technical phrase, no sanction. It is absolutely essential that there should be a sanction. There never can be any except force. That cannot be the force of the combatants. They are already engaged with all their might in the struggle. The law breaker will go on breaking. If he wins there will never even be any punishment. Our President has said that these questions will be taken up at the end of the war at The Hague. But if Germany wins there will never be any conference at The Hague. The Hague will be at the War Office in Berlin, and there will be no admission.

"If the Allies conquer there will be a conference. The forty-four powers will take part. But even so, there can never be any security against further law breaking, except that powers which are strangers to the dispute should, the moment there is sure violation of the laws of war, throw in their strength against the guilty side. It will have to be some powerful nation, or nations, that do this. We are such a nation. Our fleet is the third in the world, though our army is small. Our resources, if brought into operation, are great. We are also a determined people.

"This is no small quarrel. The fate of the world hangs upon it. That which we ought some day to do we should do now; should have done already. Technical reasons, as well as moral reasons, we have in abundance. Solemn treaties made 'between the United States and other powers,' including Germany, have

been broken by her. The breaking of a treaty is always a sufficient reason for a declaration of war if the offended party desires. We had a sufficient reason on the day on which the text of the German ultimatum to Belgium was published, even if we were doubtful about the ridiculous reason given. Germany's announcement that, if Belgium resisted the violation of her territory, Germany would regard her resistance as a hostile act, and treat the relations of the two countries thereafter according to the arbitrament of war, was enough. When precious historical monuments, which are in a very true sense the property of all mankind, began to be destroyed or to be gravely injured there was again enough. When an unfortified and undefended town was three times bombarded there was again enough. When the peaceful vessels of neutrals, as well as vessels of war, began to be blown up by floating mines there was once more enough. And, even if we did not make war, it was our duty at the very least to address a temperate protest to Germany. We did not protest. The love of fair play is inherent in the Anglo-Saxon race, as well as in most others. Even a crowd at a prizefight or a game will not tolerate repeated and deliberate foul play and wait to the end in the hope of adjudication. It will promptly drag the offending party out of the ring. But we do nothing.

"We are not a military nation and are not prepared. But our navy could at once have patrolled the seas and given security in the Atlantic. We could have kept the communications between France and England open. We could have guarded the English harbors. We could have set the English fleet entirely free to do its most important work, if it is in any way possible to do it—namely, to destroy the German navy. That once gone, Germany could never have built another until after peace was declared. She would have been heavily crippled. A declaration of war from us would also have at once shut off all American food from reaching Germany by any channel. We could also have sent at once a small army to the field. There was a time when a small additional force would have made a difference. We could have asked for volunteers. Hundreds of thousands would have offered themselves. We were not prepared, but Germany would have known that we were preparing. She would have seen that her cause was hopeless."

These quotations, representing the views of an ex-President of the United States, an ex-President of Harvard, an ex-Ambassador, a Yale professor, a Chicago professor, a Columbia professor and a Philadelphia lawyer, must serve to indicate the reasons for my belief that American public opinion now tends to favor some form of intervention, not from quarrelsomeness, certainly not for selfish motives or from desire for aggrandizement, but chiefly from the wish to have our country discharge a great international duty, thrust upon us by the irresistible force of circumstances, a duty, the proper discharge of which would make humanity our debtor for ages to come.

[See also, in reply to this question, Chapter XVIII.]

CHAPTER XV.

What Are the Interests of America at This Time?

I think many Americans must have blushed when they read Mr. Champ Clark's speech early in September and saw that he had said that we wanted to "encourage peace-making in the old world partly out of motives of humanity, but largely because we do not want to be injured." He certainly did not speak for the American people in placing that motive above all others.

Yet it is right that we should ask: What may we expect if Germany is victorious in this war?

We know the principles for which she stands. We know her disregard for obligations, spoken or written. We know her intention to gain "World Power" at any cost. Have we any reason to think that she would respect us, our wishes, our persons, our property?

Dr. Dernburg, the *ex-Colonial Secretary*, was some time ago, understood to have declared that Germany had announced its recognition of the Monroe Doctrine. (207) The Monroe Doctrine, as every American knows, dates back to 1823, when "certain European Powers showed signs of wishing to help Spain recover her lost American colonies." President Monroe said: "We owe it therefore to candor . . . to declare that we consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety." That is the important part of the Monroe Doctrine. Fortunately the republics of South America have attained such size and strength that the further statement that we could

not permit anyone to "oppress them" or to "control their destiny" might now well be modified to read that we would gladly aid them, if they needed aid, in resisting any such attempt.

Dr. Dernburg's statement was intended to be understood as an *assurance* that Germany did not intend to establish colonies in this hemisphere.

A little later our State Department issued an announcement to the effect that the German Ambassador, Count von Bernstorff, had on September 3, 1914, in a note to the department "stated that he was instructed by his Government to deny most emphatically the rumors to the effects that Germany intends, in case she comes out victorious in the present war, to seek expansion in South America."

"The sweeping statement of Dr. Dernburg is thus reduced to an official expression concerning Germany's intention with regard to South America. Thus it is seen that there was no pledge offered, but merely an expression of intention. And Americans must remember that intentions change. In the second place it related, not to the whole of the Western Hemisphere, but merely to South America. What Germany's intentions are with regard to North America, including Canada and the West Indies, was left to American imagination.

"But not for long. One day later there was published a further statement by Dr. Dernburg, and a statement by the German Ambassador, Count von Bernstorff." (208)

The latter said that a German invasion of Canada for a temporary foothold on this continent would not violate the Monroe Doctrine, and Dr. Dernburg said that by sending Canadian troops to the war, "Canada had placed herself beyond the pale of American protection."

He took pains to add that Germany would, however, extend her respect for South American territory to that of our neighbor to the north.

But can Americans afford to believe them? The papers are already asking whether "in the light cast upon German international policy by the Ems dispatch—forged or doctored, as one may choose to call it—by Bismarck to bring on the Franco-German war of 1870-71, and by the "scrap of paper" incident in this war, we can afford to adopt any policy in relation to Germany but that of extreme watchful waiting *and preparedness* for whatever events may happen in the near future."

"Certainly we have no antipathy to Germans; no racial distrust of them. But we do distrust the leading that Germany has had since 1870. We do consider that her people have been trained to follow a false ideal. We do consider that the policy of Bismarck corrupted her moral sense. A great man was Bismarck and a great deal good, but he lied without scruple, and he took for Germany without scruple or regard for justice anything that he thought would do Germany good. When he took Alsace and Lorraine he overdid the job and committed his unfortunate country to a hopeless debauch of militarism. Germany as we see it now is not the Germany of Goethe or Schiller, of the democrats of 1848; it is the Germany of Bismarck, and of intense commercialism, and of success at any price. When Bismarck told in his memoirs how he changed the wording of the French ambassador's letter and brought on the war in 1870, it was notice given to mankind that in diplomatic concerns the word of Germany may not be trusted. When the German troops crossed the Belgian frontier it confirmed the existing impression that promises of the German Government are only good so long as enforceable by the promisee." (209)

Powys (210) deals with the subject philosophically:

"Human nature is pushed forward by the very profoundest law of its existence towards light and air and liberty and happiness and leisure and culture. It is also pushed forward by a profound law of its existence towards competition and struggle and rivalry. But there is no earthly reason why these two

laws should not at least be so reconciled that the abuse of extreme poverty and the abuse of war should not be totally abolished. To lay it down as an austere, scientific dogma, as some writers do, that we must always have poverty and always have war, is not to have sufficient trust in the miraculous transformative power of life. Life has produced the human race from among the animals. Why should it not be able, with man's intelligent assistance, to clear out of the way such grotesque anomalies as extreme poverty and the slaughter of war?

"This is not idealistic or fantastic dreaming. It is the voice of simple common sense. And it is a legitimate hope for the future. Why should the human intellect which has been able, as this war proves, to devise such splendid engines of destruction as the Krupp guns and the Zeppelin airships and the submarines and the mines, not be able to devise some scientific plan by which extreme poverty and military slaughter should be brought to a sudden end? Whatever other effect this amazing war has, it will have the effect, we may hope—if the Allies win—of turning the world's attention to both these obvious necessities.

"It is for this reason, as much as anything, that neutral Americans, and others, are bound to hope for the victory of the Allies. The victory of the Germans would mean—who can doubt it?—an incredible encouragement to the policy of armaments. It would also mean—who can doubt that, either?—an immense strengthening of the fetters of caste and aristocracy."

I agree with the *London Spectator*: (211)

"Strange as it will sound to most American ears . . . it is none the less true that at this moment what stands between the Monroe Doctrine and its complete destruction are our ships in the North Sea and the battle-weary, mud-stained men in the British and French trenches on the Aisne."

"It seems ignoble, and it is, to cling over anxiously to life when daily so many thousands before our eyes give it up. This is our battle, too, that is being fought in Europe;

our destiny as well as their own that Belgians, British, French, Germans, and all the rest are struggling and dying over. This is a conflict of fundamental ideas. If the German idea wins, its next great clash seems likely to be with the idea that underlies such civilization as we have in these States." (212)

We can get some information as to the probabilities in this direction from other sources. We have seen how accurately Bernhardt and Treitschke forecast the immediate future in their writings. There were other prophets in their country. The late Mr. W. T. Arnold, grandson of Arnold of Rugby, in a summary of the "German Professional Campaign," quotes as follows from Dr. W. Wintzer's book, *"Die Deutschen in Tropischen Amerika"*:

"The moral core of the Monroe doctrine vanished on the day when the document concerning the annexation of the Philippines was signed by McKinley." He (Wintzer) claims 'the right to confront this Greater-American doctrine with a Greater-German one'; and adds: 'Equality of treatment with the United States in South America—that is the theory which we both on principle and as occasion serves, must oppose to the Monroe Doctrine and which, too, should the moment come, we must defend by force.' . . . The American order of 'Hands-Off!' in South America must be answered in the negative.

"Two of the Pan-German prophets of the future, *'Germania Triumphans'* and Dr. Eisenhart, represent Germany as fighting against both Britain and the United States, but fighting against them separately. In *'Germania Triumphans'*, the United States are first attacked and defeated by both sea and land, and Britain is represented as chuckle-headed enough, and base enough to look on and do nothing. Then comes Britain's turn. The only difference in Dr. Eisenhart's vaticination of the future is that Germany takes Britain first and the United States look on. Britain is disposed of, 'and now' says the prophet, 'it was time to reckon with America.' Not even these half-sane Pan-Germans contemplate the possibility of dealing with Britain and the United States together."

Price Collier (213) says:

"In discussing Senator Lodge's resolution before the United States Senate, on the Monroe Doctrine, the German press spoke of us as 'hirnverbrannte Yankees,' 'bornierte Yankee-Gehirne,' ('crazy Yankees,' 'provincial Yankee intellects'); and the words 'Dollarika,' 'Dollarei,' and 'Dollarman,' are further malicious expressions of their envy frequently used."

Schmoller, the political economist, writes:

"We must at all costs hope for the formation in *Southern Brazil*, of a State with twenty or thirty millions."

"Germany's purpose in the great war, as seen from here, is to teach a reluctant world that what the German Kaiser says goes. It is a war for the vindication of the Prussian say-so; a war of destruction and extermination of whatever stands up against Prussian domination; a war to parcel out the world anew, and give Prussia what she wants. Prussia has dominated the rest of Germany so completely that it has forgotten that there ever were ideas in Germany that were not Prussian. Undoubtedly Prussia is eager to dominate the rest of mankind in the same way, and morally capable of using any available means to do it. With the Prussian idea it is truly a case of world-power or downfall. It is an idea that is incapable of repose, that requires periodical exercise in the field, and must be fed on conquest if it is to keep its strength.

"That is not at all true of German 'kultur,' which we have so much been told the Germans are fighting to defend. The German 'kultur' means pig-iron, Krupps, ships, beer, chemicals, music, discipline, military service, and professors." (214)

It is obvious, at this moment, showing through the recent "statements" and "announcements" of the highly placed Germans whom I have quoted, that at least the possibility of Germany's disregard of the Monroe Doctrine is present in their minds. Circumstances enjoin caution. Americans

are to be placated—just now—not irritated or alarmed. Bernhardt, Trietschke, Wintzer, Eisenhart, Schmoller are to be repudiated.

But in view of her callous and brutal disregard of formal obligations, entered into with the majority of the civilized nations of the world, and in view of the many other reasons (See Chapter XI) for doubting the reliability of German statements at this time, can any American contemplate with equanimity the possibility of this war ending in a *Germania Triumphans*?

Is that a prospect which, in view of what we know of the purpose, interest, determination not only of the military caste, but, at least for a time, of the whole nation, Americans can regard with indifference or a condition which they can await with serenity?

Ferrero, the Italian philosophical historian, practically answers that question when he says: (215)

"This war will either increase still more the military caste in Germany or will largely destroy it. Germany is moved to the conflict with the expectation of repeating 1870: that is of making a rapid, victorious campaign, the cost of which will be covered by the immense indemnities imposed upon the conquered. And if the General Staff succeeds in this enterprise, the German army, and the Hohenzollerns who are its leaders, will achieve such prestige in Germany, in Europe, and in the world, that no strength can oppose them."

As Powys says: (216)

"It is inconceivable that it should be good for civilization at large to witness the triumph of the German spirit over Europe. The triumph of the German spirit over Europe would mean the triumph of system rather than life, of criticism rather than creation, of materialism rather than mysticism, and of self-satisfied optimism, rather than those tragic questionings of fate that mark the perplexity of the noble soul."

"Scientific efficiency, material progress, inexhaustible erudition—these are not everything. Man cannot live by science alone, or discipline either. Life must be lived by the masses, by the people."

But Professor Hale still more fully and specifically answers the question: (217)

"What do we Americans pray for as the issue of this great struggle? Russia is autocratic, but she has abundantly produced men who eagerly suffered martyrdom for freedom. Germany did once, but has stopped. Nor does German America seem any longer to raise up citizens of the Carl Schurz kind, who rebelled against this very bureaucratic militarism that has produced the war. England, France and Belgium are democratic countries. Münsterberg (218) speaks of 'the tremendous increase of the monarchical conviction.' Von Bülow, for twelve years German Minister for Foreign Affairs, quotes with approval, in his just published 'Imperial Germany,' the statement, 'German parliaments, in a comparatively short space of time, mostly sink to the level of a district council,' and expresses his own conceptions in such sentences as: 'In history strong military States have always required monarchical guidance,' and 'In foreign as well as home politics I considered it my noblest task to the best of my understanding and ability to strengthen, protect and support the crown, not only on account of deep loyalty and personal affection for the wearer, but also because I see in the crown the cornerstone of Prussia and the keystone of the empire.' As for Austria, it was against this very Francis Joseph that Cavour planned, and Garibaldi fought, for Italian liberty. Which type of ideas do we want to see succeed?

"The victory of the Allies would mean an English England, a French France, an Italian Italy, a Russian Russia, a German Germany. It would mean a Europe of free nations, each developing its own characteristics and ideals. Germany would not, I hope and believe, even lose her foreign possessions, except the little one taken from China, which should be handed back. But she should be made to restore Schleswig-Holstein to Denmark and Alsace-Lorraine to France. She should be made to

take her place as one of the family of equal nations, and not its mistress. And we should lend our strength at once, as well as our good wishes, to this end.

"The victory of Germany and Austria would mean a Germanized and bureaucratically controlled England, France, Russia and Italy; for Italy would not survive. It would be a world intolerable to live in, and intolerable for an American to think about. But thinking about it is not the only thing that he would suffer.

"The victory of Germany would put at her disposal an enormous fleet, consisting of all the ships that survived the war. Her ambition would not be sated. She aims at nothing less than world dominion. 'Deutschland über alles' does not mean 'with the exception of the United States.' She has known how to attack us. The moment she had a trained German personnel for her immense navy, South America, or as much as she wanted of it from time to time, would become a German colony. The nucleus already exists in Brazil, and could easily enough produce an excuse for war if one was thought desirable for historical purposes. To the winds would go the Monroe Doctrine and South American freedom. We, with our then relatively tiny navy, should be helpless, either to keep Germany off or to dislodge her. From South America she would strike at us. Our coasts would be at her mercy, and she could land her disciplined troops anywhere. The country would be full of spies, as France and Belgium are to-day. We should fight desperately, and our land is of great extent. But only disciplined armies can prevail in these times. Guerilla warfare is useless. Fighting would be done here by railroads and the reduction of great centres. The population of Germany and Austria is to-day larger than ours by some sixteen millions; and Germany, then the mistress of Europe, could safely bring an army into the field from many quarters, both of Europe and South America. The struggle would be bitter. We should have the advantage in distance; but the ocean is narrow to-day, as the presence of soldiers from all parts of the world on the battlefields of France has shown us. And Germany would have every other possible start upon us.

"This is no idle speculation. It is no more a nightmare than was the possibility of a Germanized Europe a few months ago.

We should stop it all by throwing our strength now upon the side of the Allies.

"I have put my arguments on the basis of Germany's breaking of international law. But I will put it also on another basis. War must come to an end. It does not belong to our generation or to civilization. Convention 1 of The Hague does not make it compulsory for any country to arbitrate a dispute such as that between Austria and Serbia, if it does not wish to. But it also does not forbid any power in the world to fall upon the aggressor. The American people know who was the aggressor, just as Italy knew. We have had the statements of both sides. That guilty government should be taught that a monstrous war of aggression will never in the future be tolerated. Such a lesson would go very far to stop all wars."

Most Americans I think agree to-day with Powys, that individual liberty is likely to flourish when all organized Empires are forgotten.

"The great philosophical anarchists of Paris and Petrograd stretch out their hands across the battlefield to the religious believers in Delhi and Tibet. The free-thinking radicals in Manchester greet the faithful orthodox in Moscow. The opposite ends of the earth are agreed, in one thing at least—that they will not suffer a State-Machine to over-ride the human spirit, or a bastard 'efficiency' to strangle the beauty and variety of human life.

"Let Americans who waver in their allegiance to the cause of the future of the human spirit because of Münsterberg's talk about 'Cossacks with their Pogroms' and English and French with their 'colored races,' think of the growth of their own republic. Let them think of these great principles of individual liberty, as against all government-machines, upon which the American ideal is based. Let them think of Jefferson and of Emerson, of Franklin and of Walt Whitman; and let them decide whether they prefer to live in a world dominated by over-drilled and over-bearing 'efficiency,' or in a world of free, *instinctive* beauty, and free, *instinctive* faith!" (219)

And again when he says: (220)

"Germany is fighting—pushed on by her Harnacks, Hæckels and Euckens"—pushed on by her Münsterbergs—in order to fetter and enchain the world in the pseudo-scientific chains of mechanical order, mechanical efficiency, and materialistic thought. The Allies are fighting to liberate the world from this oppressive tyranny. They are using the strength and daring of the Russian Empire and the strength and daring of the British Empire, in order that all races and countries, both in the West and the East, shall be free to develop their intellect, their traditions, their art, their religious faith, unpersecuted by German science.

"If when the war is over the Russian Empire and the British Empire, or one or the other of them, were to use their victory to force Anglo-Saxon ideas or Slavonic ideas upon races that were neither Anglo-Saxon nor Slavonic—upon the Teutonic states, for example—it would be the duty of the other Allies, the duty of France and Japan and Italy—if Italy joins in—to see to it that the great complex Idea, which they all share in common, was not thus narrowed and perverted.

"No, this is not a war between Europe led by Germany, and Asia led by Russia and England; it is a war between the mechanical efficiency of Germany and the instinct of self-preservation of the rest of the world.

"Let Russia give more liberty to her Polish and Finnish and Jewish subjects; let England give more liberty to Ireland and to India. Let both of them refrain from imposing their ideas upon Teutonic people. Then it will be perfectly lawful for Russia to snatch Slavonic races from the grip of Germany and for England and France to liberate Danes, Flemings, and Gauls.

"If the result of the war, upon Germany herself, is to destroy the new Bismarckian Empire, and throw her back upon her ancient free states, no German who loves *real* German culture need regret it."

I need dwell no longer upon this point.

Both duty and self-interest should lead America to make sure at whatever sacrifice that German militarism does not

in the outrageous war which it has precipitated, triumph over the democratic ideals for which little Belgium has almost laid down her national existence, for which—under whatever nominal form of government—the Allies are valiantly fighting, and for which we as well as they should be ready to make any sacrifice of life or treasure that may be needed.

I believe that: .

“As theocracy, or the attempt to make men righteous by force failed in the New England colonies; as serfdom and slavery, or the attempt to make men industrious by force, failed in Russia and the United States; as feudalism, or the attempt to make men loyal and chivalrous by force, failed in England; and as the spirit of materialistic revolution, or the attempt to make men liberal-minded and intellectually free by force, failed in France—so the doctrine of *Machtpolitik*, the attempt by Germany to impose a civilization upon humanity by force; must fail—*must be made to fail*.” (221)

Dr. Abbott, the venerable and respected editor of the American weekly, which expressed this view, was obviously still of the same opinion nearly five months later. He quotes Prof. Ostwald, a German chemist, who had recently said: (222)

“Do you ask me what it is that Germany wants? Well, Germany wants to organize Europe, for up to now Europe has never been organized. Germany wishes to adopt a new course for realizing her idea of co-operative energy or social efficiency. How does Germany propose to realize this project of social efficiency in the west of Europe? She demands that the Germans and the French shall have an equal welcome in their respective countries, and that they shall be permitted to work and to acquire wealth on exactly the same terms in either country. . . . In eastern Europe Germany will create a confederation of states, a sort of Baltic confederation, which

will include the Scandinavian countries, Finland, and the Baltic provinces. Finally, she will tear Poland from Russia, and will make of it a new independent state. The moment has come, I believe, for remodeling the map of Europe. . . . We, or perhaps rather the Germanic race, have discovered the factor of social efficiency. The other peoples of the world live yet under the régime of individualism; we Germans under the régime of organized co-operation. With us everything tends to draw from the individual a maximum of that service which is most useful to society. In this idea we Germans find liberty in its highest form."

Dr. Abbott replies:

"If it is the purpose of the leaders of Germany in this war, as I am bound to believe it is from the testimony of their own words, to impose their ideals of political and social virtue upon Continental Europe, and if they are successful in achieving that purpose, then the United States and the three great republics of South America will be the only great nations left to cherish and protect the ideals of intellectual freedom and individual liberty for which our fathers struggled in the American Revolution with the aid of such Germans as Steuben, and in our Civil War with the aid of such Germans as Carl Schurz and Franz Sigel. You remember the noble fight which Cavour made for democratic institutions in Italy against the despotism of Metternich; you remember his death-bed words, '*Chiesa libera in stato libero*,' which may be paraphrased, Freedom of conscience in a free country. Social efficiency based on force cannot exist in a country whose citizens believe in freedom of conscience and political action.

"I am aware that in this war some Frenchmen are actuated by a spirit of revenge, that some Englishmen are actuated by a spirit of jealousy, that some Russians are actuated by a spirit of aggrandizement. But, on the whole, I believe the Allies are fighting the battle for the liberty and the free development of the little state and of the unimportant individual. They are therefore fighting my battle. I believe it may be said in a very real sense that a victory of the German militarists will destroy the German people, and that a victory

of the Allies will save them. I am not at all sure that it is not the moral duty of the United States, which stands for the principles of Cavour, Mazzini, and Garibaldi, of Grotius, Carl Schurz, and Gottfried Kinkel, of John Hampden, George Washington, and Abraham Lincoln, to take some public and outspoken position against the purpose of the German militarists to remake the map of Europe on the lines so graphically laid down by Professor Ostwald. For who knows but that such a map made in such a way would mean the remaking of the great chart of human civilization? And in that chart the people of this country have a very profound and living interest."

CHAPTER XVI.

What Is the Effect of the Official Attitude, Past and Present, of This Country on (a) Americans; (b) Other Peoples?

a. Americans, I hope and believe, are becoming increasingly restive under existing conditions.

As they look back, they are, so far as our present unpreparedness is concerned, confronted by the opposing ideals of Woodrow Wilson and George Washington: (223)

"We are at peace with all the world. No one who speaks counsel based on fact or drawn from a just and candid interpretation of realities can say that there is reason to fear that from any quarter our independence or the integrity of our territory is threatened. Dread of the power of any other nation we are incapable of. We are not jealous of rivalry in the fields of commerce or of any other peaceful achievement. We mean to live our own lives as we will, but we mean also to let live. We are, indeed, a true friend to all the nations of the world, because we threaten none, covet the possessions of none, desire the overthrow of none. Our friendship can be accepted and is accepted without reservation, because it is of-

"I cannot recommend to your notice measures for the fulfillment of our duties to the rest of the world, without again pressing upon you the necessity of placing ourselves in a condition of complete defense, and of exacting from them the fulfillment of their duties toward us. The United States ought not to indulge a persuasion, that, contrary to the order of human events, they will, forever, keep at a distance those painful appeals to arms, with which the history of every other nation abounds. There is a rank due to the United States among nations, which will be withheld, if not absolutely lost, by the reputation of weakness. If we desire to avoid insult, we must be able to repel it. If we desire to secure peace, one of the most

ferred in a spirit and for a purpose which no one need ever question or suspect. Therein lies our greatness."—*President Woodrow Wilson to Congress, Dec. 8, 1914.*

powerful instruments of our rising prosperity, it must be known that we are at all times ready for war."—*President George Washington to Congress, Dec. 3, 1793.*

I select one of many communications to the papers that voice the widespread feeling of unrest and dissatisfaction:
(224)

"Many loyal Americans feel deeply humiliated at the position in which our Government now stands with regard to the war which is devastating Europe. When the German Kaiser appealed to our President—personally and publicly—he gave him not only the opportunity but made it incumbent upon him to protest publicly and in the name of justice and humanity against the contraventions of all the laws of nations of which the Germans already stood convicted. If these acts had been committed by France or by England, it would have been equally the duty of our Government to protest against them, and a dignified and forcible remonstrance made then might have had its influence without affecting our neutrality or endangering our peace; in any case we would have freed our souls from the blood-guiltiness of silence, and from an indelible stain upon our history as a nation.

"While we continue to send shiploads of food to the Belgians, let us also with fearless uprightness speak our minds to those who are starving them, exacting from them the last loaf of bread, the last pound of flesh, and the uttermost tribute that can be wrung from their distress! Cannot our countrymen realize that those who are left of this heroic people, with their King beside them in the trenches, that the French, changed beyond all belief from their old pleasure-loving lightheartedness, that the very flower of the manhood of Great Britain, aye, and even the half-civilized peoples from steppes of far Siberia are battling desperately not only for themselves and their countries, but for us and for all that we hold sacred? Is our President so blinded by his hope of being one day chosen to sit in the 'seats of the mighty' as arbiter of the destinies of nations that

he cannot or will not see that, if we now fail to make a stand for righteousness, there will be later no one so poor as to do us reverence? If we are afraid now as a nation to express any sympathy or to show any prejudice for right as against might, or to protest without fear or favor against injustice, from whom can we look for aid or even for moral support when our time of trial comes?"

I have received in MS. from Mr. Herbert Armitage Drake, a paper entitled "The Prevention of War. A Contribution to World Peace," which he has kindly given me permission to use, as an expression of opinion from another American. It is valuable and interesting in itself, and equally significant as an indication of the views which I believe are now those of a considerable and influential proportion of our people.

Mr. Drake objects to a "Federation of Nations" with an international police to enforce its decrees, because, as heretofore planned, it would be made up of incongruous elements, and would be half monarchical and only half democratic.

He says:

"Suggestions for the prevention of war so far made are likely to remain suggestions only for a long time to come. The Federation of Nations is a dream to be realized only in the far-distant future. The organization by the nations of a constabulary or world police in support of the Hague Tribunal, to give force and sanction to its decrees, would develop weaknesses similar to or more disturbing than those of the confederation of the thirteen independent nations which formed the United States prior to the Federal Constitution. It would be made up of elements from sources too incongruous to serve any united purpose; from weak states and powerful states, from small nations and great nations, from neutral states and belligerent states.

"A valuable suggestion of this character recently appearing

in the New York *Evening Post*, with the form of a constitution worked out for an association of all the great powers, has a weakness common to all of them. The entente or alliance contemplated would be composed of monarchies committed to autocracy and conquest; and of democracies committed to peace and the rights of man. As was said by Lincoln, of our nation before the war, that it could not remain half slave and half free, so the proposed organization could not be realized, and become purposeful and effectual, half democratic and half monarchical.

"Appertaining to monarchical states, there is no rule, no law, no regulation for declaring or inaugurating war. There is no means for the enforcement of such a rule, if it existed; and it is not likley to exist while irresponsible monarchs have their way. Monarchs are those who rule the people of the nation, but who are not ruled; those who are entirely without responsibility to the people. As remarked by *The Nation* at the time, the outbreak of the present war owes its inception to three emperors, one of whom is senile, one of whom is subject to periods of melancholia and the other of whom has given evidence of disturbed mental balance. The declaration and precipitation of this war was a perfect example of violent anarchy. The 'confusion worse confounded' which has succeeded it, in the war zones of Europe and in the countries involved, is an example of chaos. Law, rule, order, the concomitants of civilization, are non-existent. Barbarism, brutalized tenfold, is substituted. The anarch who is responsible for this social and economic cataclysm, deserves superhuman condemnation. No matter who, or how many are responsible with him, he could have scotched the wicked monster.

"Monarchies, of which Austria, Germany and Russia are illustrations, declare war without the permission of their legislatures. They have just done so. Their legislatures are not supreme. Their ministries are not responsible to their legislatures or to the people. Their monarchs in the matter and manner of declaring and precipitating war, are responsible to nobody. They are uncontrolled, intolerable, insufferable anarchs. In the words of Byron, written of Mark Antony and his congeners, they are 'Imperial anarchs, doubling human woes; God! was Thy globe ordain'd for such to win and lose?'

"That there should be some rule, law or regulation, some-

thing civilized controlling the declaration and inauguration of war, is beyond question. A plebiscite in democracies may and should be provided, so that the men and women who are to carry on and suffer by war, may say whether there shall be war or arbitration. The nation that goes to war without a referendum to the people, should be made to await the referendum of its combatant and required to submit to arbitration, if this referendum so decides.

"The late Herbert Spencer, in his first great work, 'Social Statics,' demonstrated a fundamental social principle. The substance of it is that the 'Liberty of each, limited by the like liberty of all, is the rule in conformity with which society must be organized.' A formal and explicit statement of this principle is that 'Every man has freedom to do all that he wills, provided he infringes not the equal freedom of any other man.' This fundamental principle is no less applicable to nations than to the citizens who compose them. It will then read, 'Every nation has freedom to do all that it wills, provided it infringes not the equal freedom of any other nation.'

"As the citizen must preserve order and uphold civilization, and arrest the law breaker caught in the act of infringing the freedom of another citizen, so should peace-loving, civilized nations uphold the freedom of weak, small, neutral nations, violently infringed by the imperialism of a great power having 'its roots not only in the ambition of a single monarch, but in the soaring will to power of the nation itself.' (See Lichtenberger's 'Germany and Its Evolution in Modern Times,' p. 175.)

"Democracies, the nations which are committed to peace, and the nations in which nationality exists, but in which humanity is superior to and above nationality and imperialism, the nations in which the legislatures, the representatives of the people, are supreme, and the people and the rights of man are dominant and the state is servient, these only are the nations qualified to form an alliance to make rules and regulations appertaining to the inauguration and conduct of war, its prevention and suppression.

"An alliance that can be realized and become effectual would be composed of democracies, committed to Magna Charta and its affirmations in the English constitution, to the principles of our own Declaration of Independence and to the spirit of the French Revolution; committed to uphold in its integrity

the government of each autonomous and homogeneous nation, undisturbed; to control and abolish militarism; to prevent and suppress wars of conquest; to end anarchy among irresponsible rulers of monarchies in declaring and precipitating war; and to subject the inauguration of war to an ante-bellum period of six months between its declaration and the commencement of hostilities.

"There would, of course, be many details of this alliance to be worked out. These allied democracies could establish for their purposes an international court; but they would be a law unto themselves, as to the extent of their own land and naval forces, because only by force could they exact and enforce the end and purpose of their alliance? And let it be remembered always, that a navy alone is not an arm of conquest. It is a peace establishment, except only when used in conjunction with and in support of over-sea armies of invasion. A military establishment of each democracy in support of that alliance, because committed to peace, would be necessary and justified. But a crushing military establishment, such as France has been obliged to maintain in self-defense, or as we should be obliged to maintain to defend ourselves singlehanded against a war of aggression, would be necessary. (See Chapter XIX).

"Here is a great opportunity for diplomacy, for the new diplomacy, the diplomacy of candor and sincerity, diplomacy for the service of the people. 'For after all,' as Sir Henry Jones remarks in his 'Idealism as a Practical Creed,' 'our salvation must come through the state.' Contemplate for a moment the magnificent achievement of the diplomacy of France in negotiating the Triple Entente—in committing autocratic Russia to the armed support of the Liberty, Equality and Fraternity of the French Republic.

"The states representing democracies should at once, by their diplomatic representatives, facilitate an approach to and a formation of an alliance on the lines, or on some of the lines, here indicated. It is not known how long this war will last. It is not too late to begin now. It would be the very depth of stupidity for us to sit still and listen to the deceiving words of Germans and Pro-Germans—to attend to Pan-Germanic falsehoods while we lie supinely at ease, jeopardizing civilization and the world's interest, for which France and England and Belgium are pouring out their lifeblood to-day. The United

States, Brazil, Argentine, Chili and Venezuela in the Western Hemisphere; Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Holland, Italy and Portugal in Europe and China and Siam in Asia, or some of them, could be formed into an alliance at once to stop this war of conquest. We could offer to equip and send volunteers to the firing line. It would be voluntary on the part of these men and patriots to fight for what their forefathers were forced to fight for and for what France aided them to fight for in 1776—to fight for what Great Britain is fighting for now.

“What if, as is rumored, Russia should fail to keep her promise to make peace only when her allies are ready to make peace, and unite with her, and should cease war before Germany’s military power were crushed? Civilization would be in jeopardy.

“But our assistance, and the assistance of the South American Republics already named, need not extend to sending our own youth to the front. Our moral support and commitment to the side of order and civilization need not extend any further than preventing the importation of food and petrol into Germany through Holland and Sweden; than releasing with our navy the navies of France and Great Britain from the police duty now imposed on them; than the sending of our troops to do colonial garrison duty for France and Great Britain, thus releasing those soldiers to go to the Western war zone.

“Let us consider Germany, with her Nietzsche, glorifying power in man as the supreme end of life; with her Treitschke, magnifying her power as the most desirable and formidable in all the world, and favoring its expansion; teaching, with her Bernhardi, the biological necessity of war to social development; with her remarkable ability in adapting to her economic uses and triumphs the world’s access to power in the face of nature, *i. e.*, the scientific and philosophic achievements of the nineteenth century; with the great advance in business and social position of her middle classes until, with them, an aristocracy of wealth and success is competing for ascendancy, with the traditional and titled aristocracy of the Prussian squire; suppressing their help with long hours and bribing them with social insurance which the employees largely pay for; claiming more markets for their wares and more ports through which to trade (see Lichtenberger’s Germany and Dawson’s ‘Social Insurance’ *passim*); is it any wonder that the spirit of conquest overcame all opposition and that the soaring will to power con-

verted her into a hotbed of world hatred? This cultivated German world hatred supports and encourages a doctrine the direct contradiction of the irrefutably fundamental national rights, (as obligatory as any treaty), above set forth, viz: the doctrine of aggressive German world power, by and under which weak and neutral states have no rights which a great Power is bound to respect.

"The war spirit 'preached to the children at school, firmly implanted in the hearts of the soldiers during their service in the regiment,' prevailed, 'so that the cult of the army had few infidels in Germany' before the war was ever declared. (See Lichtenberger's 'Germany,' p. 142.) Besides all these causes and influences, the war cult was 'carefully fed by numberless patriotic associations throughout the country.' (Lichtenberger, *Ibid.*) Hence associations ought to be formed in this country to promote the end and purpose of the proposed alliance and its realization.

"If we were as alive to our duty to-day as the Germans are to theirs as they see it; if we were as loyal in our love of peace as the Germans are in their love of war; if we were as strong to-day in our opposition to conquest as the Germans are strong in their support of it; if we saw, as clearly as we should see, that with German success in this war the spirit of the French Revolution and the principles of our own Declaration of Independence will be put in jeopardy and a depleting war of our own would be necessary to uphold our civilization and its principles as we know them, for ourselves; if we could realize that France and England are fighting for the same rights of man for which we fought in 1776, and as valiantly; if our heralding of Lincoln's Gettysburg speech as one of the beacon lights of civilization were more to us to-day than a hollow pretense, we should ally ourselves with and with all our might, fight for Belgium, France and Great Britain, 'so that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth.'"

Mr. James M. Beck (225) in a communication correcting a report of a speech recently delivered (p. 481) says that what he then did say was:

"That we could and should (1) protest against acknowledged

violation of the rules of civilized war, and (2) call a conference of the neutral states of the world.

"I pointed out that this moral protest, although we could not enforce it with an army and navy, would not be a mere futility, but that on the contrary, if our country should voice the public opinion of the world, it would have its effect. . . .

"What I said was nothing more than that the neutral states of the world might, if the war continued to desolate the entire world, consider whether by concerted action the termination of the conflict might be brought about, either by persuasion or force. The force which they could exert might be economic as well as military.

"The organized neutral states of the world, exclusive of China and the Balkan States, have a population of nearly 250,000,000. Including China, but excluding the Balkan States for obvious reasons, the inhabitants of the neutral states, having the form and potency of organized government, would be over 600,000,000. The whole world is suffering from this conflict. After another year of fighting, it may be clear that the contending forces have reached a military stalemate or *impasse* and that neither side can defeat or exhaust the other. In that case, if the neutral states were reasonably agreed as to the cause of the quarrel—and I freely acknowledge that that is a very large assumption—or if from considerations of the highest self-interest they were unwilling that the whole world should continue to suffer indefinitely for the quarrels of two groups of European states, then it is not impossible that these neutral states, acting in harmony and with the United States as a leader, could virtually compel a termination of the war. . . .

"I cannot understand how humane people can view the methods of the present war without an abhorrence that must at times find expression in vigorous language. It is no answer to reply, 'This is war and war is hell.' Wars in modern times have been accompanied by a certain chivalry which gave to them a sort of dignity and moral beauty. A war, however, in which powerful warships bombard unfortified coast towns of no strategic value and shoot down school children on their way to school, and in which Zeppelin airships pass over sleeping villages and kill babies in their cradles, has no resemblance to the other wars of modern times. The destruction of whole cities, because of the irresponsible acts of a few infuriated civilians,

is also a new and lamentable departure in the malignity of war.

"A striking illustration of this is that General Gage's army, when, on the retreat from Lexington and Concord, it was fired upon by justly incensed farmers, who, however, were civilians, did not wreak its vengeance upon the town of Boston or kill its leading citizens. This method of vicarious punishment was reserved for the 20th century.

"I share with many Americans an intense regret that the United States cannot as a nation protest against the continuing destruction of the ideals of civilization. Our silence might be explained if we had consistently refused to intervene in the affairs or quarrels of any other nation; but such is not the fact. The present Administration was so shocked by the alleged complicity of President Huerta in the cowardly assassination of Madero that to show its detestation it broke the back of the only stable government in Mexico and thus gave it for the last two years to anarchy, and the result has been the enthronement of the unspeakable Villa.

"If we were thus prepared to voice our protest as a great moral force against a mere incident of the chronic anarchy in Mexico, it seems strange that we can view with silence and with an averted eye the violation of those regulations of war which were formulated in The Hague Convention and the obligation of which our nation, in common with forty other nations, guaranteed.

"Our silence as to the moral aspect of the war is somewhat emphasized by the fact that this country has twice made a formal protest, in each case the subject of the protest being the interference with our shipments of merchandise to foreign markets. Conceding that these protests are just and necessary, yet it ought to bring a sense of humiliation to thoughtful Americans that all that we can find in this gigantic moral cataclysm to make the subject of a protest is any interference with our opportunity to make money out of the situation.

"All this can have but one inevitable result, whichever of the two groups of combatants may ultimately win, and that is a substantial impairment of the moral authority of the United States."

If we can do no more, I would perforce be content with

Mr. Beck's programme, because if it were politely—or impolitely—ignored, as it probably would be, it would result in crystallizing public sentiment in this and in other countries, and could not fail to work for right and justice.

In the same issue (226) a temperate letter on the subject of Mr. Beck's speech, likewise urges a "protest," but thinks I was "foolish" on this occasion (p. 481) in going beyond that and urging actual interference. The difference does not seem to me to be as great essentially as upon the surface. The writer goes on:

"The two recent attacks upon English unfortified towns, one by the sea and the other by the air, and in distinct opposition to the agreement which Germany signed, 'not to bombard unfortified towns,' and this last attack by Zeppelins are as brutal as the raids the Indians in this country used to make, thereby killing women and children. Such a method of warfare has always been considered as barbarous, and is in poor keeping with the claims of advanced civilization.

"Is this country to sit quietly by without a word? In the name of true civilization and in the name of outraged decency I say that we should as individuals and as a united country, while still declaring our neutrality as far as legal warfare is concerned, protest against any and all barbarous and brutal acts."

If I saw a bully beating a child or a woman, (and as between Germany and Belgium the comparison is not overdrawn), and "protested," and no attention was paid to my protest, could I stand still or go quietly away, with the feeling that I had done all "that may become a man?" Or should I feel obliged to take some personal risk to help the victim? If the latter is the natural and proper course, for a nation as for an individual, it is probable that the difference between "protesting" and "interfering" is only that of taking one step instead of two to reach a given goal.

The *time* to protest was at the outset, at what may be called the "psychological" moment, (though I have come to detest the term, as used by Professor Wilson and Professor Münsterberg); it might conceivably have delayed the outbreak of hostilities, and even a short delay might have resulted in the avoidance of war.

I must again call attention to the fact that I am not alone in my advocacy of interference. In support of my contention that there is "a steadily increasing and strengthening trend of public opinion" in favor of the necessity and propriety of some form of intervention on behalf of the Allies, even if it is only to give them our official *moral* support, I have been tempted to quote from many personal letters which, since the appearance of my pamphlet on the war, have reached me from various parts of the country.

I have been deterred by the impossibility of making such a series of quotations serve my purpose without, at the same time, seeming to magnify the importance of the work I have done, which is unfortunately insignificant. I may venture, however, to give a few extracts from such letters. They were all obviously written with no idea that they would appear in print. I have, therefore, had to omit the writers' names, and have mentioned merely their places of residence. My correspondents have represented an entirely fair average of non-hyphenated Americans, ranging in position from a Justice of one of the highest Courts in the land, to clerks, mechanics and working men. I have endeavored to omit, as far as was consistent with intelligibility, all that was personal, and to select only expressions that bore upon the point I am making. That point is, to reiterate, that the American people are, in the main, in sympathy with the views I have upheld, and that now, even those who are not in favor of actual

intervention are eager for unqualified official expression of sympathy with the Allies, and of condemnation of Germany. It must be remembered that while the pro-Germans are organized, officered, and untiring in the dissemination of their views, the pro-Allies, while vastly superior in numbers—and intelligence—have heretofore trusted to the righteousness of their cause and the common sense of the whole people.

The citations from the letters follow :

"I fully agree with you that this country has now a profound interest in the question that is being fought out. Should Germany succeed, the United States would either become her vassal, as by that time Europe would be, or else would have to enter upon a gigantic struggle to preserve her place and institutions in the world." (Philadelphia, Pa.)

"Fifteen years ago I heard and saw in Buenos Ayres unmistakable evidence that the German Government had marked the Argentine for its own, *and in the near future*. Had it not been that England tacitly stood behind the Monroe Doctrine, we should have been at grips with Germany long since—and now we haven't enough sense to know when our own battle is being fought for us. (Philadelphia, Pa.)

"Isn't our government at Washington the most despicable thing that can be imagined? Without protest it lets Germany violate our treaties and perform all sorts of uncivilized acts, and protests to England because a cargo of contraband is detained and entails a loss of a few dollars." (Wallingford, Pa.)

"No American can remain true to the ideals and principles of America, and at the same time not be opposed to Germany. Meanwhile, what can we think of a President who so little understands his people that he can find it possible to tell them that 'This has nothing to do with this country.' Who passes the Belgian outrages in silence, and whose first important action is one that adds to England's difficulties? Who lets go the one great opportunity to unite the two great branches of English-speaking peoples, and who tells us that Mexicans should be left alone to secure freedom by cutting each other's throats, after he has himself meddled with their internal affairs, and

done so in a perfectly futile manner, and in a way to plant in Mexicans the belief that we are governed by a set of old women; and that first, last, and always, we will seek peace and avoid war at all costs?

"I trust that these things do not cause you the continuous sense of nausea that they bring to me." (Boston, Mass.)

"I am not—at least not yet—prepared to support active intervention by the United States, nor do I believe it will be needed; but I believe anything short of that is fully warranted by the late, fully planned international burglary.

"It is time for strong men strongly to express strong views regarding this latest recrudescence of Cæsarism." (Philadelphia, Pa.)

"While I do not follow you so far as advising that the United States *immediately* take a part in the conflict, I believe, rather than that England be sacrificed and France destroyed, that it will be the duty of our country to prevent such a disaster by every means in its power." (Philadelphia, Pa.)

"I often hear people say that this war is being fought for the existence of this or that race, but I think that it is in fact being fought for an ideal, and is a struggle between two principles, that of free self-government by the people, and that of despotic power centered in an hereditary ruler and a military clique." (Philadelphia, Pa.)

"There are many people who think like you. Now is the time for America to repay to England and France the debts we owe them. She should stand behind them with men and money. I am an American of the fifth generation of unadulterated German blood, and I feel and I know that Germany is striking at liberty and has assumed the rôle of a gigantic freebooter. I have a neighbor whose father came from Prussia, whose grandfather was a Prussian officer, who tells me, as his opinion, that Germany should by right be crushed to the earth, even if America should have to help to do it." (Kimberton, Pa.)

"I am exactly of your way of thinking, although I am a warm peace advocate, and am estopped from openly avowing my fear and abhorrence of present Teutonic status by reason of President Wilson's plea for neutrality and my cloth." (Aikin, Maryland.)

"I can't see how anyone could acknowledge himself so mentally debased as to say he was pro-German. 'Twould be the

same as declaring in favor of a society led by lies, deceit, cowardliness (putting women and non-combatants in front of an advancing line), hypocrisy and false pretense, whereof the Germans have been proved guilty. Long ago I felt that I wished the United States would line up unreservedly with the Allies, but I hardly had the courage to say it out boldly. I was like Artemus Ward, who said he was enthusiastically willing that his brother-in-law should go to the war. Now, were it possible, I'd go in a minute."

(Wallingford, Pa.)

"I am heartily in accord with your views. I think the stand our Government has taken, under the guidance of the President, is cowardly. England and her allies are making a battle which is not only essential for our preservation, but for what is also of as much, if not greater importance, the preservation of representative democratic government. Knowing the traditions of the Hohenzollern family, their great success in literally stealing the lands of other countries, and the enormous military machine at their command, I have had ever since this war began the greatest anxiety about the outcome of it. The underlying greed and vaingloriousness that is at the bottom of it, shocks every sense of international right and natural justice which I have been taught from my youth up to respect. If the Germans should succeed in this war, it will seriously injure modern civilization and relegate us toward barbarism, probably to be followed by a century of warfare.

"We announced the Monroe Doctrine to prevent the establishment on this continent of absolutism in government. If Germany succeeds, that doctrine will become a dream of the past. If it is worth fighting for, now is the time to fight for it. It was mere child's play for our Government to become a party to the Hague Conventions and then make no effort to maintain them. We certainly have a right to make a formal protest against such flagrant violations of the provisions of those conventions as Germany has committed in this war. Having protested, we should back the protest up in every way in our power by assisting in punishing that government, which, after becoming a party to them, has flouted us by disregarding them. I am glad to find from your book, and from conversation with others, that there are more of our people taking this view every day. As circumstanced, we could not do very much in a forceful way. Our Army is too small to amount to anything,

and President Wilson is going to see to it that it does not become any stronger. Our Navy could be of material use. The mere fact, however, that we had joined in with the Allies in this war would, in my opinion, cause all the now hesitating neutral governments in Europe to cast in their lot with the Allies, and that soon would not only put an end to this most unjustifiable and unrighteous war, but would also make an end of Prussian militarism and the bullying of small nations which had not the strength to protect themselves.

"I cannot help but believe that this will finally be the outcome of the war; but why should we not help to bring it about and thereby save many human lives and valuable property that otherwise will be destroyed and wasted?" (Philadelphia, Pa.)

"I have already read your pamphlet with great interest and with almost entire agreement; I could omit the 'almost' except for the fact that I think intervention by us now, or in the near future, is hardly possible, by reason of the fact that our unpreparedness is so marked. I do not believe that there is any danger of Germany's emerging victoriously for a long time to come, if ever, and I feel that six months or a year could very well be spent by us in getting the military and naval forces of the country into some kind of shape, when we would be in a position to command attention to any remonstrances that we might address to Germany. I feel that our position is one which may well cause us anxiety. I have no doubt whatever that the country is full of German spies and secret agents, and I feel that all our ships and military stores should be guarded with extreme care and vigilance." (Philadelphia, Pa.)

"Permit me, though an entire stranger to you, to express my cordial sympathy with, and acquiescence in your views regarding our right attitude and duty as a nation in this present war." (New York, N. Y.)

"I think you have done a real service in bringing together in one place facts which speak for themselves. It seems absolutely incredible that in a civilized world we should have the spectacle of America sending supplies to Belgium in consequence of Germany's devastation, while at the same time Germany is taking away from Belgium what little she has left." (Philadelphia, Pa.)

I submit that, if my statements as to the character of the writers of the above paragraphs, and as to their geographical distribution are accepted as truthful, and if I am furthermore believed when I say that they could be multiplied many times over from other letters sent me spontaneously, they must be given some weight in estimating the present state of American public opinion. And they are entitled to still more consideration when it is remembered that I am a single inconspicuous citizen of this Republic, without official or public position, and by no means well known, even by name, to the vast majority of my fellow-citizens.

In further support of my assertion that I am not alone in my advocacy of interference I am permitted to publish here a poem by a young lady, Miss Laura Armistead Carter, of Baltimore. I am greatly mistaken if the fire and pathos of her verse do not voice the sentiments of tens of thousands of Americans yet unheard from.

NEUTRAL.

“WASHINGTON, D. C., August 5, 1914.

“Whereas a state of war unhappily exists * * and
whereas the laws and treaties of the United States * *
impose the duty of an impartial neutrality. * *
Therefore”—

“We have no pretext for declaring war.”

No pretext—true, but O America!

There is a Cause—thy cause as well as theirs

Who fight thy battles for thee oversea!

Dost thou do well to draw thy garments clear

The while the very things thou standest for

Are trembling in the balance? Shall the earth

Remain the gainer for the centuries
Of toilsome groping upward—Justify
Him, Who created? Shall Democracy,
Gazing men frank and fearless in the eyes,
Still lead her peaceful cohorts down the years
To ever widening freedom? Shall our Chiefs
Be Prophets, Sages, Servers of their kind—
'Gainst pestilence and ignorance our wars—
Our meed of victory—the Common Good?
Or shall the shadow of the Iron Hand
Blacken the earth? Shall Mediæval night
Engulf our dawn?—Torn from a Lister's hand
The knife goes back to Cain!—shall all we piled,
Stone after stone for painful centuries,
Fall crashing into chaos, while the guns
Roar sullen requiem? Earth an armed camp—
"Might" once more "right!"—O Country of the Free

Is *this* no cause of thine?

And think not that thyself shalt so escape!
The ashes of Louvain that cry to God,
The blood of "neutral Belgium," falling bomb,
And floating death that blocks the ocean lanes,
With treaties violate and oaths forsworn
Bear ominous witness to that prophet voice:
"Thou art the next in line!" Look, look, beyond!
As *he* had looked, who gave that liberty
Thou dost imperil. Judge as he, then rise
As he, far-sighted, wise, deliberate
Were he on earth to-day would bid thee rise!
Unfurl the silver stars!—unsheathe the sword!—
And *by the spirit of thy Washington*
Join hands with England! Up! then—Not in hate,
And with no shout of martial ecstasy,
But in the name of Him, the Prince of Peace,

Whose kingdom totters—stern and sorrowful,
Facing the issue—while the balance sways—
To arms! Columbia!—Lest a world be lost!”
And, again from a young lady, Miss Helen Gray Cone
(227), I may quote the last stanza of a poem entitled
“A Chant of Love for England:”

“Shatter her beauteous breast ye may;
The Spirit of England none can slay!
Dash the bomb on the dome of Paul’s,—
Deem ye the fame of the Admiral falls?
Pry the stone from the chancel floor,—
Dream ye that Shakespeare shall live no more?

Where is the giant shot that kills
Wordsworth walking the old green hills?
Trample the red rose on the ground,—
Keats is Beauty while earth spins round!
Bind her, grind her, burn her with fire,
Cast her ashes into the sea,—
She shall escape, she shall aspire,
She shall arise to make men free;
She shall arise in a sacred scorn,
Lighting the lives that are yet unborn;
Spirit supernal, Splendor eternal,

ENGLAND!”

There are many of us who are called “anglomaniacs” in these days. But if to believe in the clean hands of England in this war, to feel that she and the Allies are fighting the battle of democratic civilization against a military autocracy that has thrust the fight upon them and has conquest for its purpose, to be profoundly convinced that

they are as truly fighting our battles as if we all were parts of the same republic, is to be an anglo-maniac I am glad to be so classed. And furthermore, apart from the questions of right and wrong involved, I deeply sympathize with the sentiment that, when displayed, is apt to elicit the term as one of reproach. I am not ashamed of a feeling that I know is shared with innumerable Americans, the feeling that, after Independence Hall, the most precious edifice in the world to Anglo-Saxons, is Westminster Abbey. It was long ago said that to see an American enter it for the first time was to witness an unconscious display of profound reverence. Great Britain is filled with shrines of scarcely less significance to our people.

Knowing what we now know of the fate of Louvain, of Rheims, of Dinant, can any American read with indifference the open threat as to the destruction of "the nest of hypocrisy on the Thames"; the boastful assertion by a "learned man" (in the employ of the Berlin government, of course,) that they would show "no respect for the tombstones of Shakespeare, Newton and Faraday"?

When the war began this would have been regarded as the excited vaporings of an irresponsible. In the grim light of what has been we should all realize what would be if the war gave Germany the power to execute her threats.

This, it seems to me, is no time for hair-splitting. It is no time for Americans to aid the Germans by recalling every case of difference of opinion between us and Great Britain. It is no time for reviewing and balancing the evidence as to the justice of our respective claims on each occasion. All this is now to give help and comfort to the pro-German conspirators, whose chief hope is to awaken or to produce an anti-British sentiment. It all ignores the vital, the basic facts of the present situation. It is

ungenerous and unworthy; and it is no reply to that statement to point out instances when Great Britain has acted ungenerously or unworthily. If I believed that in every case when her and our views had differed and when there had been friction between us, we were absolutely right and she was entirely in the wrong, it would not have a feather's weight of influence upon my present attitude.

Either the Allies are imperiling their very existence in the defense of principles which we are, in times of peace, proud to call "American," or they are not. Those who believe they are not, are, of course, at liberty to base their speech and actions on such belief.

But those who agree, as do practically all Americans to whom the issue is squarely presented, that what they are fighting for includes the essentials of what this country stands for, should not lessen the effectiveness of their support by being drawn into discussions of the war of 1812, or of the Canadian boundary line. If they heartily disapprove of the official attitude of our present administration they should not be deterred from saying so by the fear of being called "unpatriotic." And if their sympathies *are* with the Allies, including Great Britain, they should be as outspoken as it is their nature to be regardless of the feeble and really meaningless accusation that they are "anglomaniacs."

If, as to the indications to-day, I misinterpret the spirit of America, if I am wrong and my critics, who advocate only a protest, are right, let us in Heaven's name, with a dozen adequate reasons staring us in the face, at least *protest*. And if we cannot do it through our official representatives at Washington, let us do it individually or collectively, through whatever channels may be open to us. If ever America had cause to be grateful to a free press it has been in the last six months. There will be no sup-

pression of candid opinion, no matter how "spare and bare and lean and mean" the ideals of neutrality held at Washington.

Mr. Paul Fuller, in an article entitled "Legal Neutrality *Versus* Moral Neutrality" (228), has most clearly and convincingly set forth the principles involved in our neutrality and likewise the widespread sentiment of regret that the government has failed so lamentably to realize and act upon its highest duty. He begins by noting that neutrality is not in itself a virtue; it is not a condition to be proud of; rather does it require explanation, not to say apology. It is, he says, "at best a counsel of prudence, never a counsel of perfection. Iago was strictly neutral when he mused on the coming encounter of Cassio and Roderigo: 'whether he kill Cassio, or Cassio him, either way makes my gain.'" They were neutrals of whom St. John write: "Because thou art lukewarm and neither cold nor hot I will spew thee out of my mouth." He gives various definitions of neutrality and shows beyond peradventure that under the strictest of them there is nothing to warrant the absurd request of the President that our neutrality be extended to "thought as well as action," a request, I may note, that has excited, as a rule, either derision or resentment. He says, quoting a writer on international law, "Neutrality is not the synonym of indifference.

"A state may have lively sympathy for one of the belligerents, and give frank expression of its dissatisfaction with the actions of the other, and yet remain neutral. To have and express an opinion upon the justice or injustice of a cause or of a line of political conduct is not to take part in the war; and this expression is not an infraction of the duties of neutrals."

He calls attention to the impossibility of compliance with Mr. Wilson's request, and adds:

"Every day of repression simply concentrates the unexpressed sentiment and forebodes an explosion. We appeal to the President to look over the field again, to consider anew the baleful influence upon the cause of peace, upon the enlightenment of nations, upon the mitigation of the horrors of war, of such a proceeding as the invasion and subsequent devastation of an unoffending country. . . .

"He will find that it overshadows all other considerations concerning this war. There may still be differences of opinion as to whether civilization and advancement are best to be served by the European hegemony of a vast military organization, or by the unimpeded progress of such democracy and representative government as rules in England or in France; but he will find throughout the breadth of the land no apology, no tolerance for the act of tyrannical assault by which the war was initiated and the territory of Belgium made the unwilling field of the most devastating conflict of all time. . . .

"The country must not be silent, cannot be silent, with honor—in fact, it has already spoken. But it would be glad to have its scattered voices concentrated in the voice of the chief magistrate, that the world may know unmistakably how America stands with reference to respect for the noblest dictates of international justice."

Once again he punctures the bubble of Presidential fancy, the idea that by doing nothing and saying nothing (except when it is a question of dollars) he will be chosen as arbiter of the destinies of Europe and of the world when the peace parleys begin. Mr. Fuller says:

"If any one harbors the delusion that closing our eyes to admitted repudiations of international law will enhance our influence with the contestants in the day when peace will follow exhaustion, let him study anew the parleys that closed the Franco-Prussian war of 1870, and be convinced that the unre-

buked violator of neutral Belgium will admit of no outside counsels as to the distribution of his spoils.

"On the other hand, what right have we to expect that the Allies will in the day of their blood-bought triumph turn for an impartial judgment and for a wise balancing of the arguments regarding the compensation due to Belgium; to the great democratic republic which paralyzed its own conscience and looked with dumb indifference upon the unexcused violation of her soil?"

Mr. Fuller is just one among millions of Americans who sadly realize that Mr. Wilson, by his futile and unworthy efforts to choke back opinion upon all the great moral issues of the war, combined with his insistent declarations, inquiries and protests upon all the commercial questions raised, has hopelessly damaged, not only his own reputation—that might be borne philosophically—but also, alas, the reputation of this country as a defender and upholder of liberty and of international rights.

Normal Angell says: (229)

"If there be any truth in the English view . . . that this war is the outcome of a national philosophy in Germany which is the work of half a dozen writers and a dozen university professors—and I think that there is something at least in that view, however much it may have been exaggerated—what service may not an equivalent number of writers and professors in America do for their country and for the world at large, by exposing the fallacies of the false philosophy and giving to the active minds of their country the foundations of the true philosophy? Could an American ask for a better place for his country in the future history of this period than that it should be said: 'The philosophy which played so large a part in provoking the world war of the twentieth century came mainly from the universities of Germany; but the philosophy which played the largest part in the world peace which mankind has since enjoyed came mainly from the universities of America.'"

A letter written by an American living abroad (230) expresses the feeling of tens of thousands of Americans living at home:

"As several of your correspondents have pointed out, the attitude of the United States baffles ordinary comprehension, especially considering the fact that the sister Republic of France, and even before—America will never forget Lafayette—was their old ally. Putting all questions of Great Britain aside, as may well be done, here was the spectacle of a long premeditated, wholly unprovoked attack on two democracies—the crowned republic of Belgium, and France—by a Power which since 1860 has acted as the bully of Europe, with hopes of enlarging its sphere of tyranny and rapine to embrace the whole world. The Belgian representatives went to Washington to report on the outrages of the Germans in Belgium. They were kindly received, and the spokesman of the States read them a little homily about justice in the abstract—and that was all! The heart of the American people is with the victims of the brutal régime at Berlin, but the politicians talk mildly of the virtues of neutrality! It is unfortunate, indeed, that the really representative men of the great Republic are not in a position to assist their country to play the part destined for a Power which has ever stood forward as the champion of the oppressed.

"Six months ago Belgium was one of the happiest and most prosperous countries in Europe. Now it is a ruin; its people have been murdered, driven into exile and brought to poverty—a country this of free institutions, a land where learning and civilization, material advance and enlightenment have marched together. The States are pledged by the honor of their name, their past traditions, apart entirely from treaties, to which their signature has been appended, to stand for the Right of Humanity—the common right to live and work. That right has been trampled in the mud. The criminal hooliganism clothed in nauseous hypocrisy which is the main characteristic of the German policy has affronted every code on which the American power is based, and America, through its representatives of the day, talks of neutrality and stands aside! America keeps its Ambassador in Berlin! Berlin has outraged every moral sense, every canon of truth, every law—human

and divine. There can be no confusing of the issue. Apparently America would have looked on with supreme impassiveness if France—France which has held the torch of civilization high through past ages, when the rest of Europe was plunged in barbarism—had been crushed under the iron heel.

"Maybe there is yet a mighty rôle for America to play, not as presiding genius at the Peace, for the Allies will stand in no need of outside assistance. It is late, indeed, but even the Saturday in the week of the world is good for action, though the opportunity has been dallied with. The real occasion was in the days of last summer, when the crime of all time was perpetrated, when a little nation was fighting—fighting for what? Just the right to live, to guard its own, to be at peace. And when the arch-impostor who has brought the German name to ignomy and has disgraced a dynasty, first threw his armies at his little foe, that was the time when America might have spoken with a voice which would have roused the entire world, declaring the infamy of the crime of the Hohenzollern crew. It might not have stopped the war, but it would have curtailed the chances of mischief on the part of the criminal dolts of the Wilhelmstrasse. It would have shown to all who pass down the world's highway that the honor of America is as high now as in 1898, when it freed Cuba. There is yet time. Or is it to be written down finally in the annals of history that America could not do its duty because another did not stand in the place of power?"

A very significant illustration of American feeling as to the administration's attitude is afforded in the following account of the proceedings at a meeting of the Democratic Club of Philadelphia. (231) Mr. Cadwalader is one of the leading citizens of Philadelphia, a distinguished member of the bar, a life-long Democrat, and a former official representative in this city of a Democratic president:

"John Cadwalader last night, at a meeting of the Democratic Club, after a denunciation of the German nation and of Emperor William, asked the club to express to President Wilson

by a resolution its deep regret that he should have sent Emperor William the congratulations of the American people on his birthday.

"In the course of his speech Mr. Cadwalader said that in his opinion the German nation had withdrawn completely from the family of civilized nations and had rendered all friendly intercourse impossible by its attitude in regard to its treaties. Germany had served notice on all nations that in the future it would follow as its guide, not its honor and sworn word, but its inclination and advantage which it was pleased to call 'its necessity.' No nation in the future could make a treaty with Germany except under the assurance that when Germany pleased it would disregard such treaty. Emperor William was the representative of the German nation, and in congratulating him President Wilson was congratulating the embodiment of the spirit which was responsible for the most hideous war in history.

"Every right-thinking American would deplore the fact that the American people, he said—for this was not a personal congratulation, but a congratulation from the American nation—should congratulate the trampler of Belgium that another year had been added to his life."

As this page is written the latest important international occurrence is the promulgation of an order by the German Admiralty declaring the waters around the British coasts "a war zone." It is not necessary here and now to discuss the extraordinary and unprecedented character of this action. It may have been revoked, modified, or denied long before this goes to print. But—I am seeking an answer to the query as to the effect upon our people of the official attitude of this government on war questions. I, therefore, quote here (232) part of a letter from Mr. Samuel Dickson, one of the leaders of the Philadelphia Bar, and all his life a Democrat of national reputation:

"It is to be hoped that the State Department at Washington

will not tamely acquiesce in the amazing proclamation by the German Admiralty. Frederick R. Coudert, of New York, has very, very justly said, that it could be considered an act of hostility, and that there can be no justification for this action.

“From the beginning the United States Government always maintained the right to treat the open sea as a public highway, and refused to acquiesce in one attempt after another to establish a *mare clausum*. It refused to submit to an imposition of the Sound dues by Denmark, or to recognize the Baltic as a closed sea. It refused to pay tribute to the Barbary Powers for the privilege of navigating the Mediterranean, and gave notice to Russia that it would disregard the claim to make the North Pacific a *mare clausum*, so that Mr. Wheaton, in summing up the discussion maintains: ‘In order to establish the claim of a particular nation to a right of property in the sea, that nation must obtain and keep possession of it, which is impossible, and, in any event, the sea is an element which belongs equally to all men, like the air; consequently, as it cannot become the exclusive property of any nation, the use of the sea remains open and common to all mankind.’ (Lawrence’s Wheaton, p. 341.)

“No one has ever pretended to assert a claim to control the navigation of the North Sea, and Germany has no more right to plant mines in the open sea between Great Britain and Belgium and France than she would have to do so in Delaware Bay, or than a property owner, who was annoyed by automobiles, would have to plant torpedoes in a turnpike.

“The right to plant mines as a defense to a harbor, from which all vessels might lawfully be excluded, is one thing, but to destroy the use of the open sea as a highway, by sowing mines which might indeed destroy British ships, but might also destroy American ships, is an act of hostility which, if persisted in, would constitute a *casus belli*, and if we had Mr. Webster, or Mr. Marcey, or Mr. Evarts in Washington as Secretary of State, prompt notice would be given that for any damage done Germany would be held responsible.”

I have not time to look far afield for expressions of American opinion on this latest example of German ruth-

lessness, and, I think I may add, of blundering. The question comes up at the same time with that of the use of the American flag by belligerents. The latter is one, of which either of two views may perhaps be taken and upheld. The former, the "war zone" order, is, in purpose and intent and therefore in possibility, to be classed with the invasion and destruction of Belgium, on the plea of "military necessity." But after all it is, from the perverted German standpoint, logical. If the houses, and shrines, the people and property, the women and children of one neutral may, without the expressed disapproval of all neutrals, be destroyed, why not the ships, the mails, the passengers, of another neutral?

Our government's action in this case has at last put on the semblance of a firm stand for the rights, at least of our own citizens.

It is to be hoped that the insulting comments of the German press (pp. 395, 400-01), and the insolent intimation of Count Reventlow (the German "naval expert"), that our government in case of trouble would not find a united people behind it (p. 397), will only stiffen its resolution. It is also to be hoped that Count Reventlow's opinion is based on the same sort of reports from German spies, hirelings, emissaries and "diplomats," as those which led Berlin to believe last July that the outbreak of war would be followed by serious trouble between England and Ireland, between England and her Indian subjects, between Canada and the United States!

In spite of mass meetings, resolutions, swaggering threats, and insidious attempts at pro-German legislation, in spite of the fact that up to this time our German-Americans have been publicly represented only by those who are Germans at heart, I still hope that as they come to know the situation, to understand the real Germany of

to-day, to differentiate between the autocratic ideals of Prussia and those which embody the genuine and lasting welfare of the German people, they will be found—should a break come—lined up on the side of their adopted country. There are reasons for doubt (see Chapter X), but no reason for hopelessness.

I subjoin two editorial expressions which are in line, so far as I can now learn, with what is being said in every part of this country. (233)

"A familiar passage in Scripture tells how Agur, the son of Jakeh, acknowledged himself baffled by the mysteries of existence. The record runs:

"There be three things which are too wonderful for me, yea, four, which I know not:

"The way of an eagle in the air, the way of a serpent upon a rock, the way of a ship in the midst of the sea and the way of a man with a maid."

"Had he lived until this time he might have added a fifth marvel—the way of Germany in making war. That is a system which defies logic and mocks at understanding. The newspapers of the empire now admit that the world's opinion is hostile to it, but the acknowledgment is less singular than the air of surprise with which it is made. Germany is amazed, as well as incensed, that other countries have not recognized the rape of Belgium as an evidence of the highest civilization and the most exacting morality.

"But the most recent development of the German grand strategy seems to be quite irreconcilable with governmental intelligence. The imperial decree making all of the waters surrounding the British isles a 'war zone,' and threatening to destroy ships and crews found therein after February 18th, whether they be English or neutral, is surely the maddest proposal ever put forth by a civilized nation.

"Earlier in the war other peoples would have been shocked by the declaration that enemy merchant ships would be torpedoed and sunk, and their crews drowned, in defiance of the plainest rules of warfare. But other procedure has prepared the world

for the purpose genially outlined by the *Kreuz Zeitung*, of Berlin:

"'England and France cannot claim from us in all circumstances and without exceptions the benevolent treatment which we hitherto have accorded merchant ships. As England has not hesitated to strew the North Sea with mines, so shall we not refrain from torpedoing English merchant ships simply because the lives of a few are thereby endangered.'

"This excessively efficient method of warfare, however, is one that most concerns England and France. The interest of the United States lies in the fact that the threat is aimed emphatically at neutral shipping. The decree says:

"'Neutrals are warned against further entrusting crews, passengers and wares to such (English and French) ships. Their attention is called to the fact that it is advisable for their ships to avoid entering this area, for, even though the German naval forces have instruction to avoid violence to neutral ships in so far as they are recognizable, in view of the misuse of neutral flags ordered by the British government, and the contingencies of naval warfare, their becoming victims of torpedoes directed against the enemy's ships cannot always be averted.'

"As plainly as words could state it, this is a warning that American and other neutral vessels may be sunk by German submarines under 'misapprehension,' and that Germany will repudiate responsibility therefor.' She might regret such contingencies, but intimates that 'military necessity' outweighs any rights of neutrals—as she has already shown in other notable instances.

"Neutral nations were loath to accept this sinister meaning of the order when it was first published; but five days later the intent was emphasized by Herr von Jagow, the imperial minister of foreign affairs. In a formal statement to the Associated Press, he declared:

"'Neutral ships, even without taking into account the unavoidable accidents of war, run the risk of being mistaken for hostile merchant ships and of falling victims to attacks intended for these ships. Neutral ships, therefore, are urgently warned again, as in the earlier announcements, to avoid the indicated war zone until further notice.'

"Still more frank is Bismarck's old organ, the *Hamburger Nachrichten*:

"Beginning on February 18th everybody must take the consequences. The hate and envy of the whole world concern us not at all. If neutrals do not protect their flags against England, they do not deserve Germany's respect."

"The misuse of the American flag is annoying to this country as well as exasperating to Germany, but no government in its senses would seriously threaten to make that an excuse for piratical operations. A merchant ship has a right to fly any flag the skipper has in his locker, particularly if thereby he can deceive an enemy and evade capture. The custom is as old as maritime warfare, and has been resorted to numberless times by every nation.

"To go no further back, Sigsbee, in 1898, reported that he had hoisted the Spanish flag on the converted cruiser *Yale* in order to get close to a Spanish prize. And it was only a few months ago that the German cruiser *Emden*, flying the British colors, penetrated the harbor of Penang and sank a Russian ship lying at anchor, a feat which all Germany acclaimed.

"Even a warship may adopt this ancient ruse, provided she shows her true colors before opening attack. Much less was it an infraction of international law or of the rules of the sea for the *Lusitania* to run up the Stars and Stripes on her dash for Liverpool, particularly as she carried American passengers, American mails and American property.

"The device was rather silly, in the case of the huge liner, but it was neither unlawful nor unfriendly to this country. The unauthorized use of our flag would become obnoxious only if it were made general; it is on this ground that the United States has very properly warned Great Britain that further employment of the American colors would not benefit her, and might endanger American vessels, and therefore, will not be tolerated. The justice of this position is recognized by so influential a journal as the *Manchester Guardian*, which says:

"If many of our merchant liners were to do the same, the result would be to diminish the value of protection given by the American flag. Not only would that be undignified in us and unworthy the nation which rules the seas, but it also would be unfair to the United States."

"But this issue is trifling compared to the German effort to exclude neutral shipping from an arbitrarily decreed 'war zone.' It is officially admitted that this does not comprise a formal

blockade, but it is clear that Germany is attempting to achieve the benefits of a blockade without its heavy responsibilities. Says the *Kölnische Zeitung*, organ of the admiralty:

"It is sufficient that the facts be told to those concerned. The consequences must then be borne by the skippers themselves, if they venture into the mine field. In the same way the announcement that the German submarines blockade the English coast must suffice."

"It requires something more than imperial decrees and fearsome threats, however, to establish a blockade. Such was the method employed by the nations in the Napoleonic wars; they repeatedly declared blockades which were hardly more than diplomatic fictions. But this feature of strategy was formally regulated by the Declaration of Paris, in 1856, and its provisions were ratified by actual enforcement in the Russo-Turkish war, our Civil war and the Spanish-American war.

"There are three absolute requirements for a recognized blockade. First, reasonable notice must be given; this Germany has done. Second, the blockade must be effective. And third, a neutral ship can be seized only upon attempting an actual breach of the blockade. The vital point is that the blockade must be uninterrupted; if it be raised temporarily, for any cause, new diplomatic notice must be given. And it 'must be maintained by a force sufficient really to prevent access to the blockaded coast.'

"The penalty provided for the captured blockade-runner is seizure. But the law, as interpreted even by German authorities, is explicit upon the point that no lives must be destroyed. Even merchant ships belonging to an enemy may be sunk only in cases of 'pressing necessity,' and 'before such destruction the persons on board must be transferred to a place of safety.' The same rules apply, but of course with greater emphasis, to neutral vessels.

"A lawful blockade by means of mines and submarines is therefore an utter impossibility, for two reasons. First, they cannot exert the required 'continuous force'; and second, their use would necessitate the sinking of captured craft, without provision for saving passengers and crews.

"This is exactly what Germany threatens, explicitly in the matter of English vessels, and as a possible result in the case

of American ships. Her war upon merchantmen therefore becomes a frank reversion to piracy.

"It is understood that she has a perfect right to hold up and search neutral ships in her declared 'war zone,' and to make prizes of such as carry contraband. But it is the possession of this very right which forbids the inhuman policy she proclaims. She cannot plead ignorance of a vessel's identity, or attack it unless it refuses to stop when signaled. The burden of proof is upon the submarine, and to torpedo a vessel on suspicion merely would be unredeemed piracy and murder.

"This is distinctly a case in which the convenient doctrine of 'military necessity' is not to be invoked. Nor would an occasional misuse of a neutral flag by belligerent vessels, as a ruse of war, justify a mistaken act of destruction. If every British merchantman approaching England flew the American colors, that would not excuse the torpedoing of one American ship.

"These facts are stated with convincing clearness in the official protest sent from Washington to Berlin. We do not know who framed this document, although it bears distinct literary marks of revision by President Wilson. But whoever the men actually responsible for it, they produced a state paper which is a model of terseness, lucidity, dignified courtesy and force, an irrefutable presentation of the relevant principles of international law and justice. No loyal American wants trouble, but the blood of the most pacific citizen must move a little faster on reading the German decree and the restrained but perfectly straightforward reply sent by our government.

"German newspapers scoff at the protests of neutral nations against the imperial threat. Count von Reventlow, an eminent naval expert, writes in a Berlin journal: •

"'We have always expected American outbursts, and we expect some even more vehement. The German government is fully conscious of all the possible consequences of its action, and the German people stand united behind their government. It may incidentally be questioned whether the people of the United States would do the same in all circumstances.'

"Despite this and like fulminations, we believe there will be no clash. There must be some remnants of sanity among the statesmen who have brought upon Germany the condemnation of the world.

"She 'hacked her way' through Belgium because that was 'the

easiest way,' and made her own treaty 'a scrap of paper.' But she has notice now that there are rights which are superior even to the 'military necessities' of a belligerent, and a flag that is somewhat more than a scrap of bunting. And back of the American government in this declaration, Count von Reventlow to the contrary notwithstanding, stand the American people."

Another paper makes more specific allusion to the case of the "Wilhelmina," now pending. (234)

"If there were any doubt as to the purpose of the German declaration of a 'war zone' around the British Isles, the tenor of the German Ambassador's communication to the State Department would remove it. Count von Bernstorff bluntly asserts that his government means to protect the food supply at any cost; that Great Britain is exceeding her rights in holding up the Wilhelmina or other neutral vessels carrying foodstuffs to German ports; and that if the United States submits to such interference, the warfare against British commerce will be undertaken by Germany without any regard for neutral rights. This setting forth of the German position is emphasized by a threat from the German Legation at The Hague, to the effect that neutral vessels within the war zone after February 18th will run the same risks as if they laid a course between combatants in a naval battle. That is to say, no attention will be paid to the American protest against the German repudiation of the principles of international law.

"Assuming that this is a correct statement of the attitude of the Government at Berlin and that its representatives at Washington and The Hague speak by the card, the embarrassment created for the State Department becomes obvious. The Wilhelmina case is now complicated to an extraordinary degree with grave questions of public policy. Germany is endeavoring to use the rights of the United States as a neutral as a weapon of defense. Great Britain asserts her own rights as a belligerent in justification of her interference with neutral trade. The United States is bound to protect itself against both. If that were all, the course of the State Department would be comparatively simple. But the circumstances under which the Wilhelmina sailed from an American for a German port raise peculiar

difficulties. The department informed the owners at the time that foodstuffs were not contraband if intended for civilian use. A few days later came the German proclamation commandeering all the food supplies within the Empire, whereupon Great Britain announced that she would have to consider shipments of food supplies to German ports as consigned to the German Government. This, of course, altered the status of the *Wilhelmina's* cargo.

"The ship is now in a British port, and the question of the disposition of the cargo is under consideration. There is no question of confiscation. The case really hangs upon the good faith of the German Government in giving assurances that the cargo of the *Wilhelmina* and other cargoes of a similar nature would not be taken for military purposes, but would be reserved for exclusively civilian use. Great Britain can hardly be blamed for distrusting such assurances; but is not the United States bound to accept them? Since, however, the weight of authority is against the German contention that an embargo on foodstuffs is illegal, it is difficult to see how the United States can consider the seizure of such cargoes an unfriendly act, especially if they are paid for and the shipper suffers no loss. At all events, it is plain that no dispute between the United States and Great Britain over the *Wilhelmina's* cargo would equal in seriousness one between the United States and Germany over the sinking of an American ship or the loss of American lives through the act of a German war vessel.

"The recent notes of the State Department have been so correct in form and in substance that there is every reason to believe it will keep its head in the midst of these perilous episodes. But the decision it now has to reach is perhaps the most momentous of all."

The current German newspaper comment, in so far as it has yet reached this country, seems to show two things: the real feeling of Germans toward America, and the counsels of desperation that prevail in Germany at this time. This is made clear by the subjoined extracts from leading German dailies:

"'When something does not suit the Yankees,' says *Die Post*, 'they are accustomed to adopt as threatening and as frightful a saber-rattling tone as possible. They reckon that the person thus treated will let himself be frightened and give in. If this does not come to pass, however, if the person thus treated and threatened with the strongest expressions pays no attention and shows that he is not scared and will not let himself be driven into a state of funk, the swaggering Yankees calm themselves soon and quiet down.'

"Count Ernest Reventlow, the naval expert, in an article in the *Tages Zeitung*, declares that the request of the United States that ships be searched before further action is taken against them shows 'that the people in Washington do not or will not comprehend the meaning of the German measure.'

"'We have so often demonstrated,' Count Reventlow continues, 'the impossibility of search that we can merely refer to our earlier remarks. Washington must know this, and therefore the demand of the note for a search and the establishing of the identity of neutral merchantmen amounts *de facto* to non-recognition of the German declaration respecting war territory.'

"Count Reventlow repeats the German order, the declaration of which he declares is a considerate warning, and adds: 'Whether it is regarded or protested against is of secondary importance.'

"Count Reventlow also says that 'the American Government's request for assurances that its ships and citizens will be subjected only to search, even in the war zone, is utterly out of the question.'

"The *Hamburger Nachrichten* says that 'the threatening sentences in the American note are quite unimpressive, and politely turned expressions do not counterbalance too evident partisanship for our enemies.'

"'One cannot escape the conclusion that President Wilson and Secretary Bryan in their communications with the Mexican pretenders and rebel leaders have accustomed themselves to a tone that is not suitable for communications with the German Empire.'

"The *Vossische Zeitung* says that while the searching of ships for contraband previously has been the acknowledged procedure,

the entry of the submarine denotes a new factor in naval warfare.

"The submarine," says the newspaper, "runs a risk against armed merchantmen. England has both armed its merchantmen and advised them to carry false flags. The result is that the submarine which undertakes the search of a supposedly neutral ship runs the risk of being damaged, or even destroyed, by an English ship sailing under a false flag.

"Shall Germany in the face of such treacherous measures throw down her arms because an American ship might possibly be wrongly torpedoed? The American note demands nothing else."

"The *Lokal Anzeiger* makes the erroneous statement that only the United States among all the neutral countries has protested against the German declaration of a naval war zone. It admits the friendly nature of the note, but says:

"All this cannot alter the fact that we must characterize the standpoint of the note as a mistaken one."

"The *Kreuz Zeitung* declares that Germany's course will not be influenced by the American note." (235)

Let the upholder of Germany's "humanity," of her "affection and friendliness for America," of her general benevolence and righteousness, consider this "war zone" proposal so that he will know exactly what it means, read the above extracts as to Germany's attitude toward us now that we are neutral, read also (pp. 217-18) the attitude of the same papers toward us when we were ourselves a belligerent, and reach his own conclusion. There must be *some* pro-Germans who are still open to conviction.

But it is impossible to dismiss this matter without considering it in relation to the other, which at this writing divides with it the chief attention of the American public, and apparently the time and energy of the Administration. The German "War Zone" decree, and the retaliatory British "Order in Council," should be discussed together. I do not pretend that it is possible for me to view these occurrences

in a frame of mind that could properly be called "judicial." Indeed, I am sorry for the American who can read the story of the undoubted and unquestioned events of the war up to this date and remain in the cool, calm, impartial, unbiased mental condition that is supposed to be habitual with the judiciary.

At any rate, to me it seems that the two proposals are illustrative respectively of the methods and manners of the two nations chiefly involved.

Germany has notified us, and other neutrals, that any vessel found after a certain date in the waters surrounding the British Isles,—the "war zone,"—is liable to be destroyed and its crew possibly drowned, or, it might be, burned to death. The notification applies not only to the merchant ships of the other belligerents. She takes pains to say that "owing to the contingencies of naval warfare," it may not always be possible to prevent the ships of neutrals "becoming the victims of torpedoes." This is, as has been said, "unrestrained piracy and murder."

The British "order in council," called forth by the German "decree," is the act which, on account of that relationship, should be contrasted with it. This order is neither more nor less, in essentials, than the "blockade" with which the world, in some form or other, has been familiar for at least a century and a quarter. In 1793 a similar, indeed in effect almost an identical proclamation, was made by England against France, and was acquiesced in as correct by every European country except Denmark.

Then, as now, and on many intervening occasions, it was designed to close the ports of the enemy to all incoming or outgoing commerce.

It is not open to question that this is the intent of the order, and that it is no more inhumane than was our own blockade of the Southern ports during the Civil War. It

is objected to because it is new in form, but it is no newer than was Mr. Lincoln's order when it was issued and for many months after, as that did not conform to the principles of the Declaration of Paris.

Any blockade involves some discomfort and some loss to the neutrals whose commerce is affected. But again, it is well to remember that our blockade of the Southern States brought suffering, distress and hardship to tens of thousands of the very persons in England who, nevertheless, stood most steadfastly for the cause of the North and of freedom.

The fact that foodstuffs intended for Germany will be seized under this order is denounced by the Government as "inhuman" and "murderous." When we read this we should remember that two German Chancellors, Bismarck and Caprivi, had defended such seizures of foodstuffs forcibly, specifically and comprehensively, that Germany has never, so far as I know, disavowed the procedure, that she employed it inexorably and savagely during her siege of Paris, and that "Bismarck indulged his humor by talking of the starving Parisians 'eating babies' while he was at Versailles."

As to the rigors of the proposed blockade, every possible assurance has been given concerning the careful protection of lives and property wherever interference becomes necessary, and in one respect it is, as far as my knowledge goes, the very mildest blockade in history, because, out of regard for the interests and the sensibilities of neutrals, the right of confiscation has been waived.

As to the asserted abandonment of customary form, our own State Department has voluntarily conceded that "methods of modern warfare may make the former means of maintaining a blockade a physical impossibility." But, in regard to this alleged departure from established prece-

dent I prefer to quote the opinion of an American who is an acknowledged expert in international law, Mr. Frederic Coudert. He says, of the Order in Council:

"This is nothing in the world but the simple, old-fashioned blockade, the object of which was to shut the ports of the enemy to all commerce going in or coming out. . . . We have no more reason for protesting than Great Britain had for protesting against our governmental regulations as to blockade when goods in British ships bound to neutral ports were seized during our Civil War. . . .

"It would seem that the orders in council are fairly within the spirit of blockades as they existed in our history and in that of foreign nations. . . . The only question that could fairly be raised under recognized rules would be as to the effectiveness of the blockade; and this question is one of fact, as our courts have held, and would have to be raised in each case.

"The two measures (the Allies' blockade and the German war-zone decree) are so different in character as to be altogether incommensurate and incomparable. The one is a fair development and application of well-established rules and precedents of international law; the other is a measure of ineffective savagery, for which we can find no precedent since Grotius first wrote his great work on the law of nations."

I make no pretense to familiarity with the ways of diplomats or statesmen. But I confess to having had a feeling of marked vexation when I learned that, even in the light of the facts above set forth, it was thought necessary for our Government to discuss the possibility of securing a withdrawal or a modification of the Order in Council on conditions formulated by Germany. These were to the general effect that she would suspend her piratical operations if England would "allow her to import all the food she needs, through agencies whose names would be communicated to the United States, and who would hand it over to licensed dealers for consumption by the civil population only."

In endeavoring to understand this proposition it should now be recalled that a previous German decree had placed all imported grain and flour under government control; that undoubtedly in the eyes of the German autocrats the needs of the army would take precedence of all other needs; that the idea that Americans would or could be permitted to supervise the distribution of food throughout Germany is so impractical as to be absurd; and that Germany has from the very beginning of this war pleaded "necessity" as an excuse for the most outrageous violations not only of treaties and conventions but of international laws and morals.

With these facts in mind it seems to me obvious that Germany has followed her "bluff" as to the "war zone," (a scarcely appreciable fraction of one per cent. of the Allies' shipping has thus far been affected), by an equally clumsy diplomatic trick, which has failed, as it should fail, to deceive anyone.

If the questions as I have stated them above, and I believe I have done so accurately, were regarded as mere business propositions would be regarded, *i. e.* on any common-sense basis,—practicability, precedent, morals, the relative value of the statements or promises of the opposing parties—the "protests" and "suggestions" that now make demands on our governmental energy and ingenuity and engage national attention would disappear.

If the discussion were, for example, among individuals, say A, G, and E, A might with entire justice say to G, "It is now a matter of record that your word is not to be depended upon, that your motives are open to suspicion, and that your morals, at least until you atone for your recent brutal treatment of an unoffending neighbor, are to be regarded with extreme disapproval by your former acquaintances. I prefer not to act for you, or to transmit

your messages, or to do anything that would seem to mitigate my intense detestation of your conduct. These feelings, I may add, are not lessened by your recent threat to disregard, in pursuance of your own aims and interests, the lives and the property of members of my family, especially as you have already, in at least one instance, illegally endangered the former and destroyed the latter."

And to E, A might well say: "You and your associates have earned my confidence and that of other persons of our class. Your present dispute inconveniences me greatly and will perhaps subject me to some loss. But there are obvious compensations. Moreover, you stand at this critical time for everything in which I believe and I do not propose to be fooled, cajoled, or bullied into adding to your burdens. I would like you to be as considerate as you can of my interests and my property at this time, but I recognize that you have already shown such consideration and accept unreservedly your statement that it will continue. I want you to feel that you have my earnest and wholehearted sympathy, and that I realize that disaster to you and your affairs now would ultimately mean calamity for me and mine."

Of course, if A acted with the bravery and generosity of which we like in imaginative moments to think ourselves capable, he would go further. But I shall stop there and, dropping allegory, dismiss this subject with the words of the *London Times*, which after speaking of the misery, almost the famine, brought about in England by our Civil War blockade, involving the whole population engaged in one of the chief of English industries, continues:

"But Lincoln's Government appealed for toleration and for indulgence, and the appeal was not in vain. Under the guidance of men like Bright and W. E. Forster, who understood the great-

ness and the value to mankind of the ideals for which the North was fighting, the British democracy did not scrutinize too closely the acts of a kindred people struggling for its life. Therein they showed the large wisdom and the large generosity of their race.

"May they not hope to-day, when they have been plunged against their will into a conflict yet more deadly, for aims which are not less high, that America will do unto them as, in the day of her visitation and of her trial, they did unto her?"

I have, I think, already sufficiently indicated what, in my opinion, has been the effect upon this country of the governmental attitude at Washington. The combination of official neutrality as to matters involving the destruction of a friendly fellow-neutral and of insistent emphasis upon one side—however just it may be—of a difference as to a commercial matter (a difference which means dollars to us, but conceivably life or death to England), has not met with the approval of the country. A representative paper, usually friendly to the President, says, apropos of the dispute as to the right of search (236) in conjunction with his insistence upon the ship-purchase bill:

"What is the purpose of the Administration in pressing the ship-purchase bill at a time when every consideration tells so strongly against it? From the point of view of foreign policy it is dangerous; from the point of view of domestic policy it is mischievous. The Dacia episode already justifies the declaration of Senator Lodge that the bill 'would bring the United States within measurable distance of war' with four Powers. For, with every disposition in the world to be on friendly terms with the United States, none of the Allies could be expected to look with indifference upon the wholesale transfer to the American flag of the German ships now interned in American ports. That this would be in effect an attempt to avoid the consequences of the enemy character of the vessel is morally if not legally certain. That it would be favoring Germany at the expense of the Allies, and so be a covert if not an open breach of

neutrality, is also clear. And if the object of the bill is not the purchase of German ships, what earthly good can it accomplish? . . .

"The protests of a few exporters of contraband who fear for their profits surely cannot be the cause of this apparent determination to go on fishing in troubled waters. Even if this method of aiding American commerce had more to commend it, there would still be a lack of generosity, of good feeling, in pushing what is at best a minor issue at the moment the nation nearest akin to us is fighting for its life. Nor is this merely a sentimental consideration. Belligerents and neutrals occasionally change places, and the friendship of Great Britain is a valuable asset, as we discovered during the war with Spain. It is inevitable that Englishmen should remind us now of the injury which our Civil War did to their trade—an injury much greater than any which has befallen our trade, and which we must bear with patience, as they did. That the case of the Dacia alone will create any real breach is well-nigh unthinkable. But if it were multiplied a hundred times by the addition of the great German ocean liners, the dispute, however settled, would create a bitterness of feeling which, among other more important results, would leave the United States completely unqualified for that rôle of arbitrator that the President so plainly is eager for it to play."

I do not want to over-estimate the importance of current journalistic literature, but there is much of it at this time that shows great American unrest and profound dissatisfaction with the course of the administration. Indignant citizens write to the papers to express their opinion that

"seeking a renewal of its tenure it is playing an unscrupulous game of politics."

Another view, scarcely less antagonistic to the administration, is voiced, though not actually endorsed, by a careful and conservative journal, (237) which usually

gives the President its support, even when in the opinion of some of us he does not deserve it:

"There are no more loyal citizens in America than the great bulk of those born of foreign parents. Nevertheless, there are Irish-Americans who would be glad to excite American hostility to Great Britain, and German-Americans who would be glad to secure American support for Germany. We do not vouch for the report that the Shipping Bill has been secretly pushed upon the Administration by certain German-American and Irish-American interests, but we do know that if those interests were represented by men both shrewd and unscrupulous they could not easily invent any better way of provoking hostility between the United States and Great Britain than is afforded by the Shipping Bill."

The editor of still another influential paper (238) says:

"We are pacific, but we undertake some duties which imply maintenance of a moderately competent apparatus of force. The Monroe Doctrine, that is part of our accepted foreign policy, is maintained not so much by us as by the navy of England. We see Germany, her vast efficiency in military matters, and the curious obsessions and aspirations to which the minds that control her are subject. We know that Germany has yearnings that conflict with our continental policy, and that what chiefly stands between them and us is England, now fighting for her life. We don't think England will be conquered, but if she should be, what have we got to back up such an answer as we should wish to make to a proposal from Germany that she should be allowed to improve the culture of Mexico or South Brazil? And there is Japan, whom we love considerably, and who we doubt not, is fond of us, but who will think no less kindly of us for having due shot in our lockers, and being not only polite and considerate, but able-bodied." (239)

I must, for the present, leave this side of the subject, not for lack of material but for economy of space. The

press of this country and its volunteer correspondents have expressed similar views from one end of the land to the other.

My own feeling as to the attitude of our present national administration was, in reply to a request for my opinion, summarized by me recently, as follows: (240)

I have since seen no reason to change my mind, but I am hoping, almost against hope, that one will present itself.

"For the nation, I would earnestly desire an Administration . . . that would realize our shameful unpreparedness to protect in time of aggression, our most elementary rights; that would not, in face of convincing evidence to the contrary, depend for such protection on futile and meaningless agreements; that would not allow to slip by, unheeded and ungrasped, a precious opportunity to make this country the real moral leader of the nations by earnest and instant disapproval of a threatened international wrong; and finally that, having lost this rare chance, would not later, when the cause of human freedom is hanging in the balance, try to raise by over-emphasis a merely vexatious and petty commercial question into one of great international importance, obviously for the sake of impressing voters already evidencing disgust."

My dislike of the secrecy of a pretendedly frank administration is re-echoed in the following editorial (241) from a paper that usually supports the President. It here refers to the "ship-purchase" bill:

"Since all those best qualified to judge have condemned the bill as an economic measure, too, entirely apart from its international aspects, there must be some particular ground, aside from an obstinate adherence to his personal opinions, which justifies the President in his own mind for pressing it upon Congress regardless of the serious perils attending its passage.

He has one of the keenest intellects of his generation, and he

must know, as well as Senator Lodge, what international complication will arise if he has his way. He has talked so much about neutrality, he has been so anxious not to stray a step from the path of absolute impartiality, he has dwelt so often upon the moral influence which the United States will exercise when the time for making peace comes if it has the confidence of the belligerents, that only a very powerful motive, it must be assumed, could lead him into a course where so many pitfalls exist. He has set forth with candor enough the economic fallacies by means of which he hopes to enlarge the American merchant marine; but he has said nothing to throw light upon the attitude of the Administration in throwing this fresh apple of discord into an already sufficiently sharp contest over the exercise of the right of search."

This so-called "Ship-purchase bill," an administration measure which the President strove by every means in his power to force through a reluctant Senate, brought forth a torrent of objection from every part of the country. Many of the editorials and letters show that, apart from the economic fallacies of the bill, the bitterest opposition was aroused by the possibility, officially undenied, that it was the intention of the administration, if the bill passed, to buy the German ships now interned in our ports.

The sympathy for Great Britain and the dislike of German aims and methods were conspicuous in every instance. Although the bill is now apparently permanently shelved, its resuscitation is possible; and in any event the illustration it affords of the administration's policies and methods and of the popular reaction to them is important. I, therefore, give a few examples, taken from papers conveniently at hand. It will be seen that the assumption has been that the intention of the administration was to purchase the German ships.

Mr. William D. Winsor, at the beginning of an excel-

lent article written from the practical economic standpoint (242) says:

"All indications point to the intention of the Government to purchase vessels from the fleet of German steamers now interned in the various ports of this country.

"Leaving out entirely the question of international complications, which would undoubtedly arise in the event of such purchase and operation by the Government, and looking at the matter entirely from a practical business point of view," he finds it indefensible.

In an article entitled: "Is President Wilson Pro-German?" (243) Mr. Curtis Guild reviews the statements of some of the disputants and continues:

"Meantime the President has not been idle. His extraordinary partisanship on the side of Germany has, save in a single instance, been unbroken. He opposed a loan to France by J. P. Morgan & Co., though such a loan by a private banking house is not merely perfectly legal, but usual. At the time of the Civil War German bankers lent to the North and English bankers to the South. During the Japanese-Russian war our bankers lent money to Japan. The loan to Russia now by American bankers is perfectly justifiable and not a violation of neutrality. Why did the President prevent a loan to France by private bankers as a private enterprise?

"The American ship *Aryan*, built in Massachusetts, owned in Massachusetts, the last of the clipper ships, was tied up in Sydney because the British Government refused to allow an American ship to carry wool, not to Germany, but to the United States for the use of the American people. The State Department spent four weeks in explaining why nothing could be done. Senator Lodge in five minutes of unofficial conversation with the British Ambassador cut the Gordian knot and the ship sailed. Wool is not contraband of war. The Administration put forward a note against the interference by England with cargoes and contraband of war, but promptly backed down with an offer to insure goods in advance to prevent annoyance

to the Allies. The Administration has successfully pushed through a bill, not so bad in time of peace, dangerous in time of war, making it easier to transfer ships from a European to an American register. What is the result? The open admission in the public press on January 24 that the United States cannot prevent the seizure of the *Dacia*.

"At the outset of the war the *Dacia*, owned by Germans, was flying the German flag. The Administration made it possible for her to shift her registry to the American flag. She is loaded with cotton, not a contraband article, destined for Germany. Of course, thanks to the Administration, having changed her flag during war, she is liable to be seized by any ship belonging to the Allies and her future depends on a prize court of the country whose vessel captures her.

"The President's shipping bill is even worse. It proposes to take 30 or 40 millions out of the public treasury by taxation of the American people and to transfer it through the purchase of German ships to German bankers, who in turn can use it for a new German war loan. This act is suggested by the same President who disapproved a private war loan to France.

"If this is not an act of war by the United States against the Allies, what is it? If the ships which happen to be the ones available were English it would equally be an act of war against Germany.

"Our merchants have the same international right, however productive of hatred, to ship cartridges, guns, uniforms, etc., to the belligerents that England had when her subjects at their own risk fed the Confederacy with material of that kind. The United States, however, cannot support its citizens or protect them if they choose to take the risk of selling articles that are contraband of war.

"The Declaration of London was assented to by every great Power, though we have not ratified it. It does, however, squarely declare the international understanding of what is and what is not 'non-contraband,' and American shippers of such goods are entitled to protection by their Government on such goods, and only on such goods if shipped in vessels that have not defied all law and custom by changing their flags during hostilities."

Americans, when this was written, were beginning to wonder if the sympathy suggested by Mr. Guild's caption, could conceivably be at the bottom of the "Ship-purchase" bill. In that case the secrecy as to administration motives would have been easily understood, although the theory was distasteful to and was not accepted by the majority of either press or people.

A "Native American" sends the following politically significant letter (244), which I quote here, because the most valuable evidence that Americans generally are not in sympathy with the course of the administration is that which comes from members of the President's party:

"My father, grandfather and great-grandfather of my name were native Americans and two generations before them lived in this land. On my mother's side was a still longer line. My forefathers and relations on both sides took part with the Colonies in the Revolutionary War. We 'Native Americans' by long descent may claim at least as much right to be heard when the honor and interest of our country is at stake as any German, Irish or other hyphenated American; and heard we intend to be. I believe that the authorities in Washington or elsewhere who listen to the clamor of those who, whether by reason of commercial interest, affection for Germany, or dislike of England, would seek to embroil us with the latter country, have no idea of the depth of the feeling of sympathy with the Allies in the present war on the part of the vast majority of native Americans of all conditions; and the pressing by the present Administration of the Ship-purchase bill during the past few weeks has—by reason of the greatly increased risk of serious friction with Great Britain which would inevitably occur should the bill become a law—affected the political affiliations of a number of people of my acquaintance who have no complaint of the President's tariff policy.

"For example, I and five of my sons living in different parts of the country voted for President Wilson. Talking with two of them a few evenings ago we found that all three of us, without any previous consultation, had decided that if he were a

candidate at this time we would not support him. On every hand among the old American stock, rich and poor, you hear voiced the opinion quoted by 'Native American' to the effect that the Allies are fighting our cause, the cause of constitutional government and liberty."

Again, as to the "Ship-purchase" bill:

"The theoretical policy of the United States, spread broadcast by the Administration, has been neutrality. If neutrality means anything, it means absolute impartiality toward the countries at war. Now, what is the effect of this questionable purchase on England, the protesting nation, and Germany, the beneficiary? It puts into the latter's hands large sums of money immediately available for war purposes, or at least for maintenance, money, which otherwise it could not secure. It relieves her of all danger of capture of the vessels by the English navy and of loss resulting therefrom. It helps to nullify England's supremacy on the ocean. It gives direct aid and comfort to Germany at the expense of her enemies, nations with whom we are on cordial terms. And to what end? That we may profit by the preoccupation of our friends and capture a share of the world's commerce which, prior to the war, we were too indolent or too inefficient to obtain.

"Apart from the question of abstract justice and from the close adherence to both the spirit and the letter of our vaunted neutrality, is that of the inadvisability of submitting a test question to a friendly nation, at a time when she is engaged in a struggle for her very existence, a struggle, moreover, in which our interests are one with hers. I am not asking that we join with her in her fight for humanity, though something may be said on that point. I am not asking that we insist upon the preservation of the integrity of Belgium, crucified to German lust for power, or that we use all of our strength to punish the wanton and unforgettable violation of that suffering country. I am asking that we refrain from placing upon England's already overburdened back a strain which may bring it to the breaking point, or at least furnish a *casus differentie* if not a *casus belli*.

"The ship purchase bill raises in larger form every question

brought up by the case of the Dacia. It encourages every American whose greed is greater than his appreciation of fair play, to go and do likewise. The word 'ghoul' is ordinarily applied to one who robs the dead and dying on battlefields or at scenes of great disaster. So great is the disgust and reprobation in which such practice is held that the penalty, even in time of peace, is death. How much better is the position of the man—or the country—who sanctions and encourages taking advantage of friendly nations, unable for the time to maintain a commerce secured by their own industry and business acumen. If the bill is passed, millions of dollars will go into the German Treasury, to be used in the prosecution of the war. Each one of the Allies is a party in interest. Each one will suffer from this nation's breach of faith and disregard of honor." (245)

Mr. William D. Howells, in a letter to *The Sun* (246), has satirically and amusingly summed up the general situation as it seems to his class—the best class—of Americans. *The Sun* has, it must be understood, been most strongly and effectively "pro-Ally." Mr. Howell's protest against the *Sun's* position is pretended and ironical:

"To the Editor of *The Sun*—Sir: Will you allow me to express a mild surprise, and some pain, at the part you have taken against our possible entente with Germany in a certain event?

"You seem to think that if we get into trouble with France and England, not to mention Russia and Japan, by our resistance of the Allies' right to search our German-American ships, we shall certainly be beaten unless we range ourselves definitely on the side of the Kaiser. You seem to see neither honor nor profit for our democratic commonwealth in the friendship of a cultivated despotism. You do not or will not look forward to the triumph when we shall be conformed to the German ideal in our civic life; yet it ought to be clear to you that this blessing is what we may confidently hope for. The system which combines the functions of the schoolmaster and the drill sergeant is surely something to be desired by every patriotic

American; and have you no longing for *l'ère majesté*, for universal conscription and an iron-sided military staff? Can you see no advantage for American youth in the teaching of such German professors as have taken it for granted that we could not know our minds, or had none to know, on questions of international morality or of mere humanity? Can not you forecast a distinct gain for our posterity by our renouncing, now and forever, under the tutelage of these gentlemen the notions of our political nonage? Shall we not unquestionably enrich ourselves by exchanging our Anglo-American literature for the German, and having that language taught in our schools, as it is in those of Alsatia and Poland, instead of the native speech? Do not you know the superiority of the romantic sculpture of the *Sièges-Allée* over the liberality of the French art which we have hitherto studied? Would not you yourselves much rather print *The Sun* in Gothic type than in the barbaric Roman characters which you now use?

"In a word, can you imagine nothing noble in a voluntary Belgium?

"The questions crowd upon me, but I will ask only one more: Suppose the Allies should triumph in the battle which they believe they are fighting for free men and free minds, for justice and honor among the nations, for peace and good will on earth, will not it be a good thing for us to remember that we once did our worst to embarrass them, since nothing could discourage them?"

b. What has been the effect of our official attitude upon other countries?

There seems little doubt that, for a time after the outbreak of the war, there was a general feeling that America, as the most powerful of the neutral nations, with high and truly democratic ideals, would ultimately be called upon as the natural guide and counsellor when the time for peace-making arrived.

It was thought "big enough and courageous enough to be discreet without being dumb, to be neutral without being neuter."

I had gathered examples intended to show the gradual change of opinion that has occurred in foreign countries, but the following editorial utterance of one American newspaper summarizes the whole matter so admirably that I prefer to quote it, in accordance with my purpose to express my views, when possible, through the writings of other Americans rather than by my own. (247)

In a previous editorial the paper in question had said: "The eagerness they (the warring powers) once showed to capture favorable opinion in this country has evaporated and the foreign press is decidedly antagonistic to suggestions of an American peace tribunal." A correspondent has called this a "gratuitous invention" and reminds the editor that he had earlier quoted utterances from foreign newspapers applauding the detachment of the United States and intimating that we would eventually be called upon to guide the distracted powers toward peace. The editor replies:

"This is quite true. It was from such foreign expressions, no doubt, that the administration leaders derived that fluttering expectancy which even the president cannot conceal, and which has interfered seriously with the performance of the government's duty.

"It was natural that in the first alarm of the great upheaval the countries involved should look with trust and friendliness to the United States. They recognized this as the greatest of the neutral Powers; they knew that its people held high ideals; they regarded it as big enough and courageous enough to be discreet without being dumb, to be neutral without being neuter.

"One of the leaders at The Hague conferences, a consistent advocate of peace and international justice, a scrupulous observer of treaty obligations, America was confidently expected to perform her part with fidelity—to preserve the most exact neutrality and to act as custodian of the rights of neutrals and of civilization as a whole. There was not the remotest suggestion of a duty of intervention; but there was very clearly

implied the obligation to speak when it was necessary and to keep the record straight for presentation to the court of nations that some day will sit in judgment upon the war.

"But this hope, which seemed widely held, was soon extinguished. One by one the conventions of The Hague, to which the name of the United States had been signed, were torn to fragments. The nationality of Belgium was struck down; sleeping non-combatants were slain with bombs from the midnight sky; cities were laid under tribute and put to the torch; deadly mines were strewn in the ocean paths of commerce, so that peaceful merchantmen by the score were destroyed and their crews flung mangled into the sea; and even the neutral waters of this hemisphere were arrogantly invaded by the belligerents.

"But none of these things extorted so much as a word from the government of the United States. Argentina and the other Latin republics literally dragged it into acquiescence in a declaration of the rights of neutrals as paramount to those of belligerents; while to this day not a whisper of protest, complaint or regret has been uttered over the deliberate repudiation of agreements to which this country was a party.

"Now what was the duty of the American government? The estimate of Theodore Roosevelt has some authority, since it was he who, as president, caused this country to join in the conventions that have been dishonored by the belligerents and disregarded by Washington. In the *Independent* he writes:

"I took the action on the theory and with the belief that the United States intended to live up to its obligations. If I had supposed that signing these conventions meant literally nothing beyond the expression of a pious wish, which any Power was at liberty to disregard with impunity, I would certainly not have permitted the United States to be a party to such a mischievous farce. . . .

"Either The Hague conventions meant something or else they meant nothing. If, in the event of their violation, none of the signatory Powers were even to protest, then, of course, they meant nothing, and it was an act of unspeakable silliness to enter into them. If, on the other hand, they meant anything whatsoever, it was the duty of the United States, as the most powerful, or, at least, the richest and most populous neutral

nation, to take action for upholding them. There is no escape from this alternative. . . .'

"To violate these conventions is a dreadful wrong. But it is really not quite so contemptible, it does not show such short-sighted and timid efficiency, and, above all, such selfish indifference to the cause of permanent and righteous peace, as has been shown by the United States (thanks to President Wilson and Secretary Bryan) in refusing to fulfill its solemn obligations.'

"Some Americans think the former president goes too far, because of a distinct reservation made that the United States should not interfere in the policies of foreign nations. And a mere protest, they say, would have been worthless; it would have to be backed up by armed force.

"From this view we dissent. The most extravagant reasoning could not put upon this country the burden of making war to uphold the conventions. But Colonel Roosevelt is exactly right when he charges that we defaulted when we did not file formal protest at The Hague. That course would have kept life in the international agreements which are now moribund, and would have saved the written word of the United States from becoming a mere 'scrap of paper.'

"Our particular inquiry now, however, is as to the effect of our negligence upon American prestige and upon the part that this government is to play in restoring peace. For months the Wilson administration has been agitated by the prospect of mediating among the Powers. Its refusal to protest against the dishonoring of the conventions of The Hague was not due, we think, to a 'cult of cowardice,' as Colonel Roosevelt says, but rather, to a tremulous fear lest such action might offend a belligerent and so avert the glory of acting as world arbiter.

"Yet this policy of silent acquiescence in wrong has not enhanced European respect for our idealism. Germany, for example, is not one of those nations which, in President Wilson's words, is going to turn to America and say, 'You were right and we were wrong; may we not look to you for counsel and assistance?' The semi-official Cologne *Zeitung* said recently:

"Despite all friendliness toward America, Germans must recognize that America cannot be the arbiter between Great Britain and Germany. American neutrality has been favorable,

on the whole, to Great Britain, and we cannot have in America the confidence we ought to repose in an impartial arbitrator.'

"*The Hamburger Fremdenblatt* denounces the 'humbug and hypocrisy of American public opinion,' and adds:

"In any case, the people of Germany need not bother themselves in the least about what the Americans think or say, so long as the German arms win. That is all that matters, for the American is a thorough opportunist and never has any sympathy with the side that is beaten.'

"There could hardly be a clearer reference to the attitude of Washington on the spoilation of Belgium. But, of course, says the hopeful American, we have a better standing with Great Britain, even though our only protest in the whole war has been about some delayed cargoes. We find one answer in an Austrian imperialistic paper:

"President Wilson has been intimating what he is prepared to do as a peacemaker. However, he must realize that this is a fight to a finish. We will not tolerate any third-party enterprise. When the time comes to clear up the final tangle there will not be any need for the assistance of any peacemaker. There will be no doubt as to who has won.'

"The *London Globe* is less arrogant and more explicit:

"Let us say frankly that the United States have already disqualified themselves for the assumption of judicial functions. They have seen every Hague convention to which American statesmen set their hands violated, clause by clause, and have not even protested. We do not blame them. They are judges of their own consciences and their own interests; but their silence proves they have set those interests in front of all other considerations.'

"More significant is the utterance of the *London Chronicle*, chief organ of the Liberal government:

"It has been the consequence of the American attitude that The Hague conventions have not only been infringed, but killed, and killed beyond visible means of resurrection, let alone extension. No State is going to let itself in for such a deception again.

"Nor is it possible to deny that the moral position of the United States has been appreciably weakened. The American note regarding contraband—a perfectly fair, legitimate and well-inspired document of which we make no complaint—would

impress the world rather differently if it had been preceded by notes in other quarters regarding the violation of Belgium, massacres of non-combatants, illegal and merciless money fines, bombardment of defenseless towns and the scattering of long-lived mines in the open sea.'

"The humiliating fact is, not only that we have lost caste because of our failure to make good even in form our pledged word, but that, as one of the nations which laid the basis of written international law at The Hague, we have defaulted as a trustee of civilization."

To this may be added a moderate and well-reasoned editorial on "America's Silence" from a London paper: (248)

"Between the peoples of Britain and the United States the traditional feelings of kinship have been intensified by this war. And Englishmen set a high value on America's sympathy and goodwill. On the other hand, the Government of the Union has not been always included in this estimate. It has been criticised for a lack of the valuable quality which should have spurred it on to protest with energy against the violation by Germany of international law. It is not enough to be neutral only in terms of negation. Something positive is also expected. No country set greater store by The Hague Conventions than America. She professed to regard them as the safeguards of civilization. And now Germany has broken them deliberately, systematically, and ruthlessly, without evoking the faintest protest from Washington. Nay, there has been no inquiry instituted. Law, morality, humanity, have been trodden under foot, yet the humane President who withheld his recognition from Huerta because Huerta's hands were bloodstained evinced no interest in the punishment or condemnation of some of the most heinous crimes ever perpetrated.

"It is to be regretted that such criticisms should be uttered or provoked. They cannot do good. People are apt to lose sight of the circumstance that the United States Government, if it had a policy at all, would doubtless choose a humane one in harmony with the sentiments of the bulk of the people. What it has are interests mainly mercantile, and these it furthers to the best of its power. And to find fault with America for pro-

moting her mercantile interests and postponing the vindication of public law would be an impertinence as breezy as to insist that because of this reserve she should be allowed to arbitrate between the Allies who are fighting to uphold international law and the Teutons who have outraged it without calling forth one vigorous protest from the neutrals. The attitude of the American Government throughout this disastrous war is pregnant with far-reaching consequences in the moral issues which it has raised or left without solution. It has implicitly acquiesced in the abolition by Germany of the public law of nations and in the worthlessness of treaties. The conception of a neutral State like, say, Belgium and Luxemburg has been disembodied. The hope of establishing an equilibrium of political forces on the basis of international agreements has been definitely dispelled. Henceforth might owes no allegiance to human or divine law, it is a law unto itself. Any belligerent who likes can invade the territory of its law-abiding neighbor, slaughter its unoffending citizens, take hostages for their good behavior, and shoot these if its own drunken soldiery commits excesses and lays the blame on innocent civilians. For the lofty hopes raised by America's initiative in the reform and enforcement of international law there is no longer any place among the implacable realities which her silence has tolerated and encouraged. The far-reaching changes in the political framework of Europe which this quiescence renders indispensable will, when the time comes to embody them, be carried out without the need of active co-operation on the part of the Government of Washington. It will be the ingathering of the harvest by those only who sowed the seed."

If we investigate German opinion, as expressed in their papers, we find it, on the whole, justly unfavorable to us as possible arbitrators, and, whether justly or not, equally unfavorable to us as a nation. (249) The *Kölnische Zeitung*, in an article from which I have already quoted, says:

"Despite all friendliness toward America, Germans must not allow themselves to be deceived, and must recognize that Amer-

ica cannot be the arbitrator between Great Britain and Germany.

"American neutrality, on the whole, has been favorable to Great Britain. In view of all this, we cannot have in America the confidence which we ought to be able to repose in a Power which would act as an impartial arbitrator in regard to an arrangement for peace.

"We cherish no feeling of irritation against America because she is friendly to Great Britain. Such a feeling is only natural, as Great Britain is the American motherland, but it is just for this reason that we fear prejudice, and we must in a friendly, but firm, manner reject America as an arbitrator."

"Count von Reventlow, writing in the Berlin *Tages Zeitung*, claims that America is hopelessly prejudiced in favor of England, and states that this is clearly shown in the way that America handles questions of contraband:

"Shipments whereby only the Allies benefit, and which constantly strengthen the military efforts against Germany actually work out in practice as a support of one belligerent to the detriment of another, and are contrary to the spirit of neutrality."

"What has particularly irritated German opinion is the tone of the American press, and this is very evident in a paragraph quoted by the London *Times* from the *Kölnische Zeitung*, which says:

"What has happened, in the most widely read and in the majority of American newspapers, in the way of odious attacks upon Germany, abuse of the Emperor, and insulting pictures, has hardly been surpassed by the dirtiest London gutter journal, and the great majority of the American people, however highly we may honor a respectable minority, have found pleasure in this attitude.

"There is further weighty consideration that while, upon the whole, the American Government has preserved strictly an outward neutrality, it has again been seen that there are different ways of being neutral, and America's neutrality has, upon the whole, favored England."

"Quite a contrary view on the stand of the American papers is expressed by Dr. Ludwig Stein, the editor of that influential organ of Jewish opinion, *Nord und Süd*, who, writing in the Berlin *Vossische Zeitung* under the heading 'The Change of

Opinion in America,' says that public opinion here is swinging in favor of Germany and claims that—

"An especially happy achievement of Count von Bernstorff is that he succeeded, during a visit to William Randolph Hearst, the American newspaper king, in capturing this sovereign and over six hundred American newspapers for the German cause. To capture Hearst is equivalent to a battle won. Since the visit of Count von Bernstorff to Mr. Hearst, the whole Hearst press has come out openly for the German cause.

"Any ally is welcome to us in these grave times. The peace societies, which are very powerful over there, have at their head Andrew Carnegie, who has remorsefully renounced his early accusations of misbehavior against the Kaiser and is beginning to move tremendously in our favor.

"This spirit from below is being met more than half way by willingness from above. Secretary Bryan, despite the fact that his son-in-law is an English officer, Captain Owen of the Royal Engineers, is known throughout the country as the 'Prince of Peace' and the 'Angel of Peace.' President Wilson himself is quietly preparing for his future rôle of *arbiter mundi*. It gratifies the self-consciousness of Americans indescribably once more to be chosen to play a great, world-historic mediatory rôle."

"The *Hamburger Fremdenblatt*, however, does not believe in American sincerity, and gives prominence to a violent tirade against us from the pen of a correspondent who is described as 'a partner in a great German firm in New York.' It runs, in part:

"One factor is the general humbug and hypocrisy of American public opinion. Religion, virtue, abstemiousness, candor, and honor are the stock phrases with which Americans are stuffed on every possible occasion. In any case, the people of Germany need not bother themselves in the least about what the Americans think or say as long as the German arms win. That is all that matters, for the American is a thorough opportunist and never has any sympathy with the side that is beaten."

There is another point of view, different in some respects from mine—especially in its estimate of the present

national administration—but worthy of consideration. It is admirably expressed in the following letter, written to a London weekly by a Philadelphian, who, as the letter shows, is uncompromisingly on the side of the Allies (250)

"Born and bred an American, I am, by every circumstance of descent, association, and inclination, not only for the Allies, but pro-British to the core. When in England last autumn I was most anxious as to where the sympathies of my countrymen would be placed. This was caused by what I read in your newspapers, and by my knowledge of the imperfect welding of so many races into our citizenship. To me, and many like me, therefore, with getting home came the unexpected relief from this anxiety and much gratification. For where we feared lukewarmness or downright animosity we found enthusiastic understanding and sympathy for the Allies—and increasingly so it is wherever I go. Frankly, however (and this is why I write to you), the tone of many English newspapers, as well as private letters, becomes very trying. There seems to be growing among you a feeling that our national neutrality should be more sympathetic. The neutrality of a nation *cannot* be sympathetic, and to be neutral it must be just and fair. Many of us wish we were young and were allowed to help to fight your battles. Everywhere I go I find women knitting for your soldiers and working men sending from their scant savings to help your sick and wounded. But of a necessity all this must be individual, or if collective, certainly not national. I do not agree with the President's policies, and I am not of his party, but I respect and believe in his honest wish to be neutral; and if I believe his desire to purchase ships to be an economic error, I certainly think that his one object is to serve his country best. Remember that a vast number of our people are of German birth or extraction, and my only wonder is that they are so comparatively passive under the tremendous burst of enthusiasm for you and your allies. Remember, too, the three generations of Roman Catholic Irish who have been absorbed into our population. One thing only have they remembered of the old country, and that is how to hate England

and the English. Surely America is not responsible for the way they hate you. And with all this, can you wonder that, as a nation, we are bound to be cautious and just in our neutrality, regardless as to where the sympathies of the vast majority of American individuals are placed? I think this ought to be plainly said and plainly understood between friends. Surely it is a great deal that the embittered relations between England and her thirteen colonies are forgotten, and that we no longer hold in remembrance the cold comfort that came out from England in those awful days of our Civil War, when our national existence, too, was at stake. The people of this nation—this English country beyond the seas—now thrills with you in your joys and in your sorrows; it mourns with you for your dead; your heroes will become the heroes of our race; and we each one of us try to aid in softening the horrors of the war, for in understanding, in brotherhood, in fellowship, we are of the English make. The position of a neutral nation, however, is hard enough. Do not make it bitter."

A paper which has been one of the staunchest and most powerful of the supporters of the Allies in this country takes up, in a leading editorial, under the caption of "A Word With Our English Friends," this subject of the expressions of discontent from them and others. While I am personally in sympathy with the "emotional" views, which it rejects, I appreciate its clear and cold presentation of the situation as it sees it: (251)

"Assurances of American sympathy with the English cause do not meet the hopes of all the English people. From Canada, from Australia, and from England itself we have received expressions indicating disappointment at our attitude of neutrality. Something more helpful than sympathy, something more partial than neutrality, protests against the doings of Germany, and in some quarters policies not distinguishable from actual interference in aid of the Allies, seem to have been expected. In its most widely prevalent form this feeling is based upon the belief that in the general interest of neutral Powers now and hereafter we ought to have protested under the

terms of The Hague Convention against the violation of Belgium's neutrality, against the destruction of precious monuments of architectural or sacred interest to the whole world, against the laying of mines, and even against atrocities which have never been proved. In another form, and less frequently manifested, there has been a feeling that we ought to interfere, and with force, because England is really fighting our own battle, the battle for deliverance from the spirit of military conquest and world domination which, we are reminded, unless it now be crushed, will ultimately endanger our own peace and perhaps our national existence.

"These views are not those of men in authority. Official England knows very well that they are unreasonable, that the theory of international action to which they correspond could not be defended either in law or in morals. They are largely of emotional origin, due in some part to the passions of war, and to the perfectly natural disposition in times of trial and danger to turn for help to any source from which men can persuade themselves that help ought to be expected. . . . The English view then" [in our Civil War] "was perhaps an 'exclusively commercial' one, but no American now has the least desire to recall those bygone matters in any spirit of resentment or retort. The cause for which England fights, the cause of the Allies, has the sincere sympathy of all the American people save a part of those whom ties of blood bind to the German cause. For the German people we have feelings of friendship and admiration; it is the ideals, the spirit, and the purposes incompatible with freedom, with peace, and with the deeper interests of humanity which a militaristic imperialism has forced upon them, that we find totally unacceptable. To those ideals and purposes we are opposed, from them we withhold our sympathy, and nothing can shake our faith in the justice of the cause in which the allied forces are arrayed. With that our English friends must be content. We know that in sober reason they do not and cannot expect any other demonstration of our friendliness and moral support than has already been plentifully given. It is only because in times of great psychological disturbance the suggestions of the emotional and the thoughtless may find too wide acceptance and lead to misunderstandings that we have felt it well to call attention to the matter."

Mr. Harold Begbie, writing from New York to a London paper (252), says, and I agree with him, that the American press voices the attitude of the nation with greater certainty than the government at Washington, and adds, speaking of the end of the war, that:

"When that day comes, will not America gratefully recollect that, although its Government had no word but neutrality and sat throughout the struggle with hands carefully folded, the honest newspapers, loving democracy more than the exigencies of politics, made it sufficiently clear to the nation of freedom that America was not upon the side of aggression, militarism, and a despotism of the divine right? I dare to say that the newspapers of America have saved American honor."

Mr. James Davenport Whelpley, a well-known American publicist writes (253) that:

"When America realizes how deep are the issues involved, a frank abandonment of neutrality, as an effort to secure peace, is more than a possibility.

"It has not yet fully dawned upon Americans just how deeply they are and will be affected by this struggle-at-arms in Europe, for the political and economic changes now begun are absolutely international in their full meaning. A stronger realization of these things will come soon; there are already signs that it is on the way, and then these much-discussed questions as to the blame for the beginning of trouble or for subsequent destruction and the sufferings of the civil population will be dismissed from the American mind, for the time at least, and the greater question, one upon which the entire nation will be as a unit—how to aid in bringing about peace—will absorb all thought and energy."

I have never had letters that were more gratifying than those I have received from England and from France, in the last few weeks. Their expressions of appreciation of

what I had tried to do, when read in comparison with the little I had succeeded in doing, often made me feel ashamed.

And yet, among them, there was one, from Glasgow, which, while kindly as to my individual efforts, went back to the Napoleonic era for the purpose of accusing this country of "ratting" at that time—whatever that may mean; and there was another—also complimentary to me personally—from Edinburgh, which takes me quite violently to task for having inadvertently written "English" when the proper word was "British"; another (from Edinburgh), almost insulting as to my misuse of "English"; and a fourth (from Gourrock), which deals with me more politely, but very firmly, on the same subject.

Those trivial incidents illustrate, in a way, the point made in the above letter. We must not, at this critical time, be diverted by non-essentials. We should not be led into the use of unkindly adjectives, or the employment of any form of unfriendly criticism that is at all avoidable. If ever there were a time when under-statement was desirable it is now. We have here an administration which is the official mouthpiece of the country and which has assumed a certain attitude and announced a given policy. What proportion of the American people it represents—so far as the war is concerned—it is just now impossible to determine. As to domestic matters, it was originally a minority administration; and I am of the opinion that it is even more so to-day in regard to foreign relations. Of course, it is true that, in a sense, it stands for "America." For what it does, within limits, "America" will bear the blame or shame, or receive the credit or glory.

It is difficult at times to dissociate in one's mind a country, a whole people, and those who for the time being represent it. So, when Americans, who would like noth-

ing better than to be standing shoulder to shoulder with the Allies, read sarcastic criticism of "America's" behavior, it hurts, even though they realize that it is in fact criticism of a few persons who, largely by accident, happen just now to have great power. And it hurts all the more, I suppose, because in our own minds and hearts we feel that the criticism is not altogether unjustified.

But when the distinction *can* be made, it should be made. No lever for exciting anti-British feeling here, is left untouched by the unscrupulous engineers of German policy. There is no use in putting new ones in their hands.

It is difficult to say to others, even to kinsmen, "my country is wrong," although one may both think and say so at home. There is also an instinctive repugnance to having the correctness of such opinion demonstrated to the world by someone else. The individual with independence enough to do his own thinking much prefers, when possible, to do his own fighting.

This does not mean that Great Britain should not defend with the utmost vigor every particle of right or advantage to which she is entitled. It is meant simply as a plea for such avoidance of bitterness in both public and private comment as can be avoided by people fighting for their lives. I am disposed to think that as time goes on it will be found that the bitterness may safely be left to us. It is proverbially never absent from a family quarrel.

It is only fair also, both to the administration, of whose attitude I do not approve, and to the real Americans—as distinct from the German-Americans—to call attention to the fact that the latter are, without reason, as much discontented with our official position as are we, who have good cause for discontent. Some of the expressions from

our German-American press will make this clear: (254)

"An interesting feature of the movement is the fact that the German-Americans feel that they have behind them the support of the powerful Irish-American community. Thus, for example, the editor of the Denver *Colorado Herald* writes that he is publishing an article, 'emanating from the German-Irish Legislative Committee in Chicago,' which 'includes a call to every voter to write to his respective Congressman and Senator favoring this proposed law, and furthermore we will call the attention of every Irish and German organization in the State of Colorado, to this movement and urge them to work for the acceptance of same.' Senators Hitchcock and Works come in for a full meed of praise and receive promise of enthusiastic support in their campaign to stop this export of arms. The Milwaukee *Germania-Herald* writes:

"These two Senators have their hearts in the right place. In their eyes every dollar gained in this unworthy weapon-trading is blood-money. They see in every implement of destruction sold to England a testimony that this dirty lust for profit has turned us into a nation of hypocrites, which, while professing to work for the restoration of peace, is really only reckoning how much it can gain by a shameful traffic.'

"An almost universal feeling seems to pervade the German-American press that our neutrality is merely a name; a 'Dollar Neutrality,' the *New-Yorker Herald* calls it, and goes on to say that it is only invoked to the detriment of Germany:

"All the powder- and gun-factories of the entire land are working at breakneck speed. For whom? From official circles comes the unassailable answer—For the warring nations of Europe. In reality it is more than this, for while the German Fleet is so situated that it can not drive such traffic from the high seas, unquestionably it is for the foes of Germany. So much for the official neutrality of the United States.'

"In the bills now before Congress the Illinois *Staats-Zeitung* sees an admirable means of forcing the hands of the Administration:

"The Administration must show its colors and state whether it regrets having no means at hand to prevent the exportation

of contraband or whether the lack of such means is welcomed as an excuse to support England and her allies.'

"The *Staats-Zeitung* is not very hopeful, for it regards the President and his advisers as utterly prejudiced in England's favor:

"Despite the wonderful successes of the Germans, the President, as well as his pro-British followers, is still convinced that England's rule of the world can not be shaken and that the war must end in a defeat of the Germans.'

A solemn warning for the future comes from the Baltimore *Deutsche Correspondent*:

"It is a momentous question that the Congress of the United States has now to decide . . . what will our relations be with a Germany which has not been crushed, but has crushed some of its enemies—as the outcome evidently will be. Is the United States powerful enough to risk throwing away the friendship of a people who command the respect of the world by defending themselves against enemies who outnumber them five-fold? We should offend England, we are told, if we refuse to sell her munitions of war. Why should England be offended if we refuse to do something for which we took her to task after our Civil War?"

"The German Socialist papers all take the same attitude, expressed by the *Chicagoer Arbeiter-Zeitung*, which thinks that legislation is useless, and is very angry with Mr. Schwab and his fellows. It speaks bitterly of German capitalists who are so patriotic that they tumble over themselves to sell to Germany's foes weapons wherewith the German people may be destroyed."

The outcry as to the trade in munitions of war continues as this chapter goes to press. All the old arguments, all the accusations contained in the above extracts from the German-American press are repeated again and again, wherever Americans can be got to listen. A bill is introduced in the closing days of the session of Congress authorizing Mr. Wilson "to lay, regulate and revoke embargoes on all ships and vessels in United States ports, or United States or foreign vessels, whenever in his opinion

it is necessary, until fifteen days after the commencement of the next session of Congress."

This may mean nothing, but it was introduced, "after conference with the President," and, unfortunately, to many Americans that is far from reassuring. The only editorial utterance on the subject I have now space to quote is as follows: (251)

"We cannot give full credence to the report we printed the other day, that 'President Wilson is considering the advisability of asking congress for authority to impose an embargo upon the shipment of all supplies to belligerent nations.' We cannot conceive of his adopting a course so unpatriotic, so dangerous and so immoral. Our reasons are found in some obvious facts which we purpose to state here in plain terms.

"The demand for the congressional action described has won the support of a few heedless citizens, who deceive themselves with the theory that it would promote the cause of peace. But chiefly it is the propaganda of German-American agitators.

"It is essentially a pro-German movement. The utmost efforts of its advocates cannot make an American project of it. Not only do their mass meetings seethe with execration of Germany's opponents in the war, but they express their true sentiments by hissing and hooting the American government and its highest officials.

"Moreover, their most plausible arguments are hopelessly unneutral in implication. For example, they say that there was a precedent in the embargo upon shipment of arms into Mexico during the recent civil wars. Of course there was. But then the United States most emphatically was not neutral, for this government openly aided one faction by lifting the embargo. The advocates of Germany want the United States to do for that country, by shutting off the supplies of Germany's opponents, what it did for Villa by lifting the prohibition temporarily. It is their privilege to urge the action, but it is an unwholesome pretense to call it an act of neutrality.

"Another favorite argument is that their plan would 'hasten the end of the war.' They accuse this country of prolonging

the strife, of adding to the awful suffering and waste of life, by what Representative Bartholdt calls 'America's shameful traffic in arms.'

"But even in putting forth a humane plea they cannot conceal their real purpose. For Mr. Bartholdt's complaint is not that the traffic is 'shameful,' but that it 'makes us silent partners of the Allies'—a disgrace which he proposes to remove by making us the open partners of Germany. The official pro-German organ, the *Fatherland*, speaks even more plainly:

"'Were the war material from the United States withheld, the war would come to an end in sixty days or less. The size of the contracts placed by the Allies in this country is proof that they are without facilities for carrying on a contest on such a large scale. England finds herself in a difficult position, and could not go on enlarging her forces without the munitions being shipped to her from the United States. As for Russia, she would be immediately at the end of her resources were the American markets closed.'

"Nothing could be more explicit than this. The war could be stopped—by American intervention, by this country's abandonment of neutrality. It could be stopped in sixty days—by the simple expedient of throttling the adversaries of Germany so that she might complete the subjugation of Belgium, France and Great Britain. It could be stopped—if the United States deliberately took the side of Germany and assisted her to crush opponents that would be left 'without facilities'—that is to say, unarmed.

"These agitators, while campaigning openly in behalf of a foreign nation, urge that they are advocating 'true neutrality.' In the name of Americanism, they denounce the government and people of this country as dollar-grabbing hypocrites. By sheer vociferation, they seek to show that the American attitude is unheard of, an infraction of law, a defiance of morals, a dastardly participation in carnage for the sake of profits.

"These charges are utterly and preposterously without foundation. The legality of the supplying of arms to belligerents by neutrals is impregably established by statutes, by judicial decisions, by proclamations, by the universal custom of generations and by the unanimous consent of the nations of the world, including most emphatically Germany herself.

"So far as the United States is concerned, we quoted the

other day the official utterances of Jefferson, Hamilton and the Federal Supreme Court; and, for the rest of the world, the agreements signed at The Hague. As to this war, the American position, in compliance with the strictest rules of international law, was stated in the President's proclamation of August 4th.

"That document reaffirmed that the laws of the United States do not interfere 'with the commercial manufacture or sale of arms or munitions of war,' and provide that 'all persons may lawfully and without restriction manufacture and sell within the United States arms and munitions of war and other articles ordinarily known as contraband of war.'

"If, however, the advocates of an embargo want European authority for the American position, they can find it in the course of Germany itself, which supplied arms to both Japan and Russia in 1905; to both Turkey and the Balkan States in the recent wars, and at various times to every important country in the world. And when they hiss the name of Secretary Bryan at their meetings they should remember that he holds a note handed to him on December 15 last by the German Ambassador, which says:

"The Imperial German Government agrees that under the general principles of international law no exception can be taken to neutral States letting war material go to Germany's enemies from or through neutral territory, and that the adversaries of Germany are authorized to draw from the United States contraband of war, and especially arms.'

"But if the legality and propriety of the traffic are conceded and appeal is made against it on moral grounds, or in behalf of humanity and peace, the case is even more conclusive, for it is rooted not merely in the decisions of governments and the rules of international law, but in logic and the fundamental principles of justice.

"The most obvious answer to the demand is that an embargo would be a flagrant, inexcusable and malignant breach of neutrality. In the beginning, in accordance with custom, the American markets were declared open to all the belligerents on equal terms; they are still, so far as this country is concerned, as open to Germany as to England or France. The reason Germany cannot now obtain American war supplies is that her adversaries bar the way through control of the sea.

"For the United States now to reverse its declared position

would be to nullify the advantages won by England and France at the cost of many lives and vessels. By so doing this country, in effect, would confer on Germany the power of a great Atlantic fleet, for it would arbitrarily deprive her opponents of an advantage they have achieved through superior naval power.

"The act would be not only unneutral in principle, an intervention in behalf of one group of belligerents against the other, but it would be an indefensible violation of an explicit provision of one of the conventions of The Hague, to which the United States is a party:

"The rules impartially adopted by the neutral Powers shall not be altered in principle during the course of the war by one of the neutral Powers, except in the case where experience shows the necessity for such action in order to safeguard a nation's rights."

"So far as the rights of the United States are concerned, they irresistibly demand strict adherence to the rule of free export of war munitions. Violation of it would not only be dishonorable, but would create a precedent of the most perilous kind. No matter how distant may be the next war of the United States, the country is certain to be unprepared; and if it must then depend upon its own resources for arms and ammunition, the result will be disaster. We keep no large war supplies on hand, and before American manufactories could meet the demand the nation would be at the mercy of the enemy.

"This is precisely the reason why the nations are agreed that the selling of munitions by neutrals should be unrestricted except by the liability to capture on the high seas. As Professor Albert B. Hart, of Harvard, says:

"This self-restraint (imposed by neutrality), does not include the shipment of military stores, for an obvious reason: that some nations have not sufficient factories of small arms and ammunition, cannon and clothing for themselves. They could never indulge in war, even in self-defense, if they could not import these necessities both before the war begins and while it is going on."

"The most notable example now in view is Belgium, which is buying arms and ammunition in the United States. The Germans are operating for themselves the huge Belgian arms factories at Liege; and the German-American agitators, in the

face of this, would have the United States help Germany to crush Belgium by refusing to sell to her the weapons needed for self-defense.

"It is true that Germany is entitled to use the military advantage she has won in Belgium, just as the Allies are entitled to enforce their control of the sea. If the United States had refused from the beginning to permit the export of arms, it would be unneutral to reverse that attitude for the benefit of Belgium. But, having declared our markets open, and having supplied Germany with materials as long as she was able to transport them, we cannot justly close those markets to her opponents.

"Most of the advocates of the embargo are frankly pro-German. But its pacifist supporters should realize that the plan, far from promoting peace, would be the strongest possible stimulus to militarism. Germany for years has had the greatest manufactory of arms in the world, and the changing of the rule that neutrals may supply weapons to belligerents would mean that every other nation would be impelled to adopt her system of piling up vast armaments in times of peace.

"Those who urge the embargo as a measure of humanity and civilization are fatally in error. They ask that the United States should arbitrarily make new international law—not for the benefit of the world, but for the benefit of a single belligerent. What they demand would amount to active intervention in the war. It would be dangerous, destructive and dishonorable. It would be neither justifiable nor effective. It would make us false to our obligations, false to neutrality, false to the duty of guarding our future security and false to the cause of peace."

A review of the difficulties into which America, described as "an unfortunate old gentleman"—"Uncle Sam"—has been plunged, in spite of—or because of—its neutrality, has been made by the same paper. (256) It describes the rigid technical attitude of the President, saying that he has carried passivity to such an extent that the moral influence of America has suffered partial eclipse, and continues:

"This rigid attitude has been dictated largely by the President's desire to be selected as mediator when the war ends. Events have shown that his purpose, as well as the interests of the United States and of humanity, would have been served better by an active than a passive neutrality. The low estimate of America held by the allied nations is due wholly to her failure to protest against violation of the conventions of The Hague.

"But, aside from this, it was evident early in the war that strict neutrality would create special difficulties for the United States. Both sides strenuously wooed American public opinion through official and literary advocates, and each was hurt and surprised when Americans showed a disposition to give the other a hearing. Each belligerent group charged the enemy with unbridled atrocity and perfidy, and this country's disinclination to enter the quarrel mystified and exasperated both.

"It was so perfectly clear to Germany that the war had been wickedly forced upon her, and that Belgium was a treacherous foe of civilization, that she bitterly resented American condemnation. France was chilled by our official aloofness. And England, although gratified by evidences of moral sympathy, has not failed to admonish us that our attitude would have been more worthy of a great nation if it had been the same in all respects as her own.

"The reason is obvious. Nations at war are naturally in an abnormal state of mind. Fighting for their very lives, neutrality becomes to them inconceivable; moral sympathy only exasperates them, and, as an eminent German has remarked, 'foreigner means enemy.'

"We have already quoted many influential persons and newspapers to the effect that American mediation is impossible. Some further expressions will be enlightening as to European opinion of this country.

"Let us take Germany first. Ten days ago the *Cologne Gazette* said it was 'boiling with rage at England's despicable conduct,' and added: 'Some neutral countries, too, including the United States, have forgotten what fair play means.' A week later it remarked that 'American neutrality is only a thin curtain behind which zealous, loving service to England conceals itself.'

"Public feeling is turning strongly against the United States,'

reports the Berlin correspondent of a Copenhagen paper. And the head of the German branch of the Standard Oil said the other day that Americans had shown themselves 'pitiful weaklings.'

"French opinion is more polite or more effectively censored, but former Premier Clemenceau has bitterly condemned American favoritism toward Germany. As for England, we find the London *Express* complaining that the administration 'is ready to buy votes by a show of tail-twisting,' and the *Morning Post* charging that 'the only points on which the American government has officially expressed it itself are those in which the Allies stand to suffer and Germany to benefit.'

"Even in this country the views of neutrality are in just as sharp conflict. Robert Bacon, a diplomat of experience, has declared that our policy touching the war is 'weak and unwise.' Another American charges that 'the administration has been the catspaw of German manipulation,' while Curtis Guild, who was our representative in Russia, criticises the 'extraordinary partisanship on the side of Germany.'

"Meanwhile German-Americans are holding noisy mass meetings to denounce American 'subservience to England' and to demand their special kind of pro-German 'neutrality.'

"So we see that our pitiful picture of Uncle Sam is not overdrawn. Europe mocks at his laborious efforts to maintain an attitude of official impartiality, and he is becoming more unpopular every hour among the excitable belligerents. The London correspondent of the Chicago *Daily News* has written to his paper:

"'Conversations with persons of force, representing the sentiments of Great Britain, France, Russia, Italy and Germany, compel the conviction that the United States is making no real friends in this war. The general charge against us is that we are displaying a shameless lack of idealism, chivalry, magnanimity and courage. . . . It seems that the whole of Europe is hardening against America. One cannot doubt, as matters stand, that when peace comes the United States will have no hand in making it.'

"'We are going to be cordially detested by the whole world when this war is over,' says an American ambassador to one of the belligerent countries, according to the New York *Tribune*; and that paper adds: 'It is not inconceivable that even Germany

and England may become friends before some Germans and some Englishmen forgive Uncle Sam for his middle course.'

"Most of the criticism leveled against us is due to the inevitable unbalancing effects of the war upon the minds of belligerent peoples. But much of it arises from our refusal to utter a word in behalf of the dishonored agreements of The Hague, to which we had pledged our support. There the United States has been faithless to its duty, and has lost the chance to gain a moral ascendancy that would have been a powerful influence for peace and for the best interests of humanity. At a recent meeting to advocate the strengthening of international law, Earl Grey stated the case conservatively:

"The neutral powers who signed the conventions of The Hague missed a great opportunity by not protesting against the violations of the international regulations that occurred in this war, and thereby promoting collective responsibility by all civilized nations for the maintenance and enforcement of international law.'

"But we have already discussed this question in detail. Our concern now is with the extraordinary difficulties of being a neutral. If there were nothing else, the shipping controversy in itself would afford striking evidence of this. All England, for example, was agitated by the hoisting of the American flag over a vessel purchased from a German firm; but a few days later all England exulted in the hoisting of the same flag over the *Lusitania*.

"The fact is that Uncle Sam, who is actually losing sleep over his responsibilities, is suffering the proverbial fate of the peace-maker and the innocent bystander. The belligerents are never too greatly preoccupied to heave an occasional brick at his well-meaning head.

"There really ought to be established an international course in this supremely difficult profession of neutrality. Its subtleties are quite beyond the capacities of the American people. If some nations can spend untold millions to fit themselves for war, we could well appropriate a liberal sum to train ourselves for the intricate duties of keeping out of it. Senator La Follette's resolution calling for a conference of neutral nations is a move that should be carried through.

"For, after all, that proposal touches upon the biggest issue of the war. The world has seen, and is seeing every day, a con-

stant extension and encroachment of the rights of belligerents. It is by no means too soon to prepare for a united declaration which will establish the rights of neutrals, whose task is to preserve the institutions of civilization, and which will be maintained against the assumption of nations at war that military necessity justifies the violation of every principle of international law."

The whole question seems to me of much importance to both the material interests and the fair fame of America. As we have seen widely diverse opinions upon it are held both here and abroad. Its reflex effect upon our domestic political conditions is fraught with such great possibilities, that, for the benefit of those Americans who are concerned as to their country's honor, and for the instruction of those whose votes will, within two years, uphold or condemn the administration to which that honor has been entrusted, I want to quote one more carefully considered and weighty editorial view of the situation. (257) Under the title "America's Duty and the Rules of War," it notes that we have been passing judgment on the governments of other countries in this time of war, says that it is about time we should form our judgment concerning the attitude of the government of our own country, adds that war is a test of character, illustrating its meaning by the recent revelation of Belgium's "soul of heroism," and continues:

"How is the American nation standing the test of war? There are two judgments about America. One is the judgment which we Americans have welcomed: That America is the land of liberty, the land of justice to all men, of equal law for all, of brotherhood and comity. The other judgment is that which some foreigners have passed upon us: That America is the land of the dollar, the land of commercialism, of self-seeking, of the desire to 'get rich quick.' Which judgment is true?

"The answer is to be found not in what individual Americans think or say, nor even in what Americans as individuals may do in the way of generous giving to those who are suffering the privations of war; it is to be found in what our nation does as a whole, in its formal and official action and utterances.

"It will help us to form our own judgment if we listen reasonably to that of others. Here is the judgment of one. It is expressed in the *Toronto Globe*: 'There is something morally wrong with the man, whether Canadian or American, who can picture the indescribable sufferings of the Belgian people without a sense of rage and indignation at those responsible for that ruthless and calmly deliberated crime. There would be something wrong, cowardly, and criminal in the Canadian nation if, under the circumstances, Canada did not, at once and to the last power, strike for Belgium's defense and for the defense of innocence and the preservation of honor among nations. More than that. The civilized world will convict the American Republic of wrong and of cowardice and of complicity in the worst international crime since Napoleon's unpardoned offense if that free nation, itself the heir of all the ages of struggle for liberty, does not soon, and in terms the world will understand, make straight and solemn protest, in the name of international law, to the world's court of public opinion against Germany's violation of international agreements to which the United States was a pledged party. . . . A nation that loves righteousness is under compulsion to abjure iniquity.'

"Let us listen to another voice—it is that of the *London Spectator*: 'Can it be wondered at that, even though we may be unreasonable, and though, of course, we ought to see the American case and so forth, we feel out of heart that America seems to reckon up the matter in cold dollars and cents rather than in terms of flesh and blood and human suffering?'

"It is easy to resent such strictures; but resentment will do us no good. It is easy to say that these judgments are passed by those who are facing the perils and are stirred by the emotion of war. But the real question is whether they are true or not. And the way to find out whether they are true is not by answering back, but by looking the facts in the face. What do those facts show?

"They show that the American nation, as a nation, has made its solemn representation to one of the belligerents, not on a

question of flesh and blood, of humanity, of justice to the defenseless, but on a question of American profits in trade."

The conduct of England in our time of great struggle over questions of human right and human liberty is then noted, and it is said that, as Americans judged England sharply for what she did then we should listen to the judgment of England on what America is doing now:

"And it is not as if we had had no chance to make our voice heard regarding questions of honor and liberty and public law. We had our chance—a very great chance—even before the storm of war actually broke. To the rule that neutral territory should be kept free from invaders we had pledged ourselves by hand and seal. Every foreign nation as well as our own Government knew that Belgium was in peril. We could have sent an identical note to every European nation that in case of hostilities this country expected Belgium's territory to be kept inviolate. We lost that chance when the first German soldiers passed the Belgium border. Still we might have spoken, even though our protest could not have prevented what the German Chancellor has acknowledged to be an international wrong. Morally we were bound to speak, and technically we still had the right to speak. But the time passed and we continued our silence. Six months have gone by. The only sign of interest which our Government has officially shown in the effects of the war has been an interest in copper, and cotton, and foodstuffs, and the like.

"Has, then, all chance for setting ourselves right been lost? We are convinced that it has not. The true beliefs and interests of the American people can still be voiced. The United States is not concerned solely with one violation of a single Hague Convention; it is peculiarly concerned with the maintenance of the whole spirit and purpose of the rules of civilized warfare."

The article then recites some of the rules of international law and of The Hague conventions and continues:

"The principles underlying these and the other rules are perhaps most succinctly stated by this one rule, numbered 68:

"Modern wars are not internecine wars in which the killing of the enemy is the object. The destruction of the enemy in modern war, and indeed modern war itself, are means to obtain that object of the belligerent which lies beyond the war.

"Unnecessary or revengeful destruction of life is not lawful."

"It is upon the principles embodied in this rule and exemplified in the other rules that the Conventions at The Hague were based. It is because the nations of the earth which were civilized enough to observe laws for individuals within their borders recognized that there was also an unwritten moral law of civilization as between nations that they established those Hague Conventions. The violations, therefore, of the Hague Conventions are something much more serious than even the breaking of a pledged word. They are attacks upon this fundamental law of civilization. Excuse for such violations cannot be found in any technical defense, for the fundamental law which those violations break is not based on any technicality. If any nation in the world is interested in maintaining the public law of nations, this fundamental law of civilization, it is the United States. To allow the violations of that law to pass unnoticed is to be unfaithful to civilization.

"That there have been violations of this public law of nations in the war now raging there is no doubt. That law was violated in the invasion of Luxemburg and Belgium, and it is charged that that law was violated in Chinese territory. It has been violated in the dropping of bombs by airmen upon civilians and upon private property, whether the towns in which such civilians were killed and such property destroyed were defended or not. It has been violated in the deliberate bombardment of undefended towns and undefended districts in great cities. It has been violated by pillage, by the levying of illegal contributions upon at least one province and several cities, by the exaction of collective penalties for individual acts, by the demand for millions of dollars of merchandise from private parties. It has been violated in the needless bombardment and destruction of monuments of religion, education, and art. It has been violated in the forcing of inhabitants of occupied territory to furnish information about the armies of their own nation. It has been violated in the laying of mines in the open sea. It has

been violated in raids by sea and land, and by other measures whose only possible military consequence, and therefore whose evident object was to strike terror into the hearts of non-combatants. In addition to undeniable facts there have been official accusations which go to show that in this war there has been exhibited time and time again a ruthless brutality that cannot be explained as the irresponsible action of individual soldiers, but involves the deliberate military policy of responsible officers.

"If there had never been a Hague Convention signed, the moral interests of the United States in these infractions of the public law of nations would still be plain. The fact that there are Hague Conventions and that the United States has signed and confirmed them makes all the more plain not only the interest of the United States in these infractions, but the right of the United States to say something about them.

"In the face of these facts, how can the United States remain silent? It is the plain duty of our Government, supported as it is by the public sentiment of our people, to let the belligerents know what the United States thinks about these 'relapses into barbarism.' To say that a protest issued by the United States on this subject would mean war, as some have said, is to ignore the fact that we have already undertaken a protest, and there has been no sign of our intending to take part in the war. The only difference is that the protest we have made is a protest about our pocketbook, while the protest concerning the violations of the rules of war is a protest that concerns humanity and morality.

"America's duty concerning the violations of the rules of civilized warfare would, we believe, be fulfilled in part, if not in full, by a note addressed and sent to all the belligerents, if not to all civilized governments. Such a note should be drafted by at least as practiced a hand as that which prepared the recent statement concerning munitions of war and other matters affecting American neutrality. It should set forth the fundamental character of the public law of nations on which the rules of war are based. It should recount not only those rules of war which have been explicitly stipulated in writing by common agreement of the representatives of the nations, but also those rules which may be said to form a part of the international common law of war. It should recount the nature of the vio-

lations of those rules, and point out, at least as explicitly as the protest with reference to neutral trade, the character of the acts that have been a denial of civilization. Whether the guilty nation or nations be specified or not matters little or nothing. Whoever finds that the cap fits can put it on.

"By such a protest we believe the American nation can yet do much to mitigate the war; for no nation, however indifferent to public sentiment, will care to invite the condemnation of the American Government. If the United States is to have any part in determining the nature of the peace that is to follow this war, as President Wilson believes that it will, its influence will be determined largely by the course it now assumes; and if its influence then is to be for international morality, it cannot ignore international morality now."

With this admirable, though to my mind too conservative, summary of the facts or principles bearing upon America's duty at this crisis, I must leave the matter with my readers, not, however, without the hope that the majority will agree that we should do *something*,—something definitely on the side of justice and decency, even if it is only a protest.

CHAPTER XVII.

From the Confusing and Contradictory Reports from the Fields of War and from Other Information to be Gleaned Elsewhere, Are There Any Indications That Justify an Opinion as to the Final Outcome of the Struggle?

I, of course, do not make the slightest pretense to ability to answer a question as to which the experts of the world disagree. But it is of such interest that any reasonably intelligent person who thinks about the war at all—and who does not?—can scarcely refrain from speculation on the subject. It is probable that here, in America, the masses are better informed as to the whole series of events since August 1st, 1914, than are the people of any other country. Moreover, the field to be surveyed is so vast that to get a comprehensive view, a true perspective, remoteness is essential. It was amusing in September and October to find how much more was known to the average American than to the German-Americans returning from Carlsbad, Berlin, or Munich, who disembarked in New York eager to instruct and, if necessary, to convert their fellow-citizens.

The failure to have definite views does not, therefore, arise from any relative lack of information on this side of the water, but from the essentially insoluble nature of the problem at this time. It must be admitted that, in considering it, my opinions are unavoidably influenced by my hopes. So far as the results up to this date—the end of March—are concerned, neither side seems to have gained any material preponderance of successes. The

losses in dead, wounded and prisoners, are estimated as nearly equal. The territory occupied by the Germans in France and Belgium, is about the same as that occupied by the Russians in Galicia. The expenditure in money appears to be in the aggregate approximately the same for the two sides. The losses at sea, although the balance is in favor of the Allies, are so far from being decisive that they might almost be ignored.

The determination to fight to the bitter end is said to be equally inflexible in all the countries concerned. An American paper (258), a short time ago, reviewed the situation, which it described as a "gigantic deadlock," and said that in view of this:

"It is interesting to recall some of the early predictions. We shall note them in chronological order.

"In mid-October Paul Leroy-Beaulieu, a noted French political economist, estimated the duration of the war at seven months. At the end of November 'an officer of high position in General French's army' was quoted as follows:

"The war will be over before June. Early in the summer Germany will be ready to make peace on the best terms she can obtain. This prediction is purely a military one, and leaves out of consideration what terms Germany will be able to obtain and be willing to accept."

"About the same time an interesting forecast, attributed to 'a military authority,' was published in Paris. It said:

"He divides the war into six periods—two past, one present and three to come. The first was the German advance through Belgium and into France. The second was the battle of the Marne and the German retreat to the Aisne. The third is that of the fighting on the Aisne, continuing and developing into the effort to reach Calais.

"The fourth period will be a German retreat and a battle on the Meuse. The fifth will be a further retreat and a battle on the Rhine. The sixth will be the march to Berlin.

"He estimates that the battle for Calais will last well into December. He assigns five months to the battle of the Meuse—

till about May 1, 1915. The campaign on the Rhine should last nearly twice as long—say until February, 1916. The march to Berlin and the negotiations should bring the war to an end in 1917. He assumes that the operations will be steady, with no sudden collapse of either front.'

"This, it will be recalled, is in harmony with Field Marshal Kitchener's estimate of a war of three years; recently he has been said to have remarked that 'the war will begin in May.' But while the French expert was laying out a struggle lasting until 1917, an American economic expert was telling us that it must end in a few months. Roger W. Babson said:

"I care not how much the statesmen of the various nations talk about a long war, I can say authoritatively that the bankers of these nations know that it cannot be long. . . . I have found bankers agreed that the attempt of either side to fight this war to a finish means financial bankruptcy for Europe.

"It is all very well to talk about unlimited supplies of men; but the nations cannot fight without huge sums of money. The rulers of Europe have gone crazy.'

"Guglielmo Ferrero, the eminent Italian historian, gave his estimate as two years. He recalled the theory, once very widely held, that the deadliness of modern weapons and the colossal size of modern armies would make wars impossible; and said that not only had this idea been refuted, but that these factors had made a quick decision impossible. 'In proportion to the measure in which they have been perfected,' he wrote, 'armies have become less adapted to fulfill their mission.'

"About the middle of December Hilaire Belloc, who is noted as a military writer, declared that no one could safely predict the duration of the conflict. But, he said, 'it will end within three months after the allied troops have obtained a firm foothold on German soil.'

"Early this year a letter from a French officer told of a new French army of 1,000,000 men that would go to the front in February, preparatory to a decisive movement against the Germans in March and April. 'The war,' he said, 'will last two years, at least.'

"The military expert whose illuminating articles appear in the *New York Sun* and *The North American* wrote on January 6th:

"Neither Germany nor her enemies have destroyed the military power of their opponents. So far, it is a plain draw. . . . After five months of war there is not the slightest sign to be found anywhere of immediate peace. . . . The unmistakable belief in neutral countries that Germany must ultimately lose is based on the conviction that she cannot forever match men and money with three great powers. . . .

"Early in the war, Lord Kitchener fixed three years as the limit of the conflict. To-day the best witnesses in Europe agree that it will be longer rather than shorter."

"Thus the weight of opinion seems to be that the struggle will be long, bloody and incredibly costly. The most potent factor is that neither side shows the remotest desire for peace. Germany still manifests extreme confidence of victory, while Great Britain, France and Russia have made solemn treaty to fight until Germany is subdued. Neither force has suffered sufficiently to make peace more attractive than the prospects of victory, however remote.

"No conceivable settlement now would satisfy one group or the other. Peace must await the time when one has suffered crushing loss, or when general exhaustion compels a compromise.

"What, then, are the chances for a decisive victory by either side? Competent observers see no probability of such a result, unless through a sudden collapse of the fighting spirit on one side, of which there are now no indications.

"The amazingly stubborn contest along the western battle front certainly does not suggest it. The swift advance of the invaders during August had a decisive look, but before mid-September the invincibility of the German army had become an exploded myth. Man for man and gun for gun, the forces of France and Britain and Belgium had proved themselves the equals of the best troops of the Kaiser. Paris was saved, the German march on Calais and Dunkirk was broken, and for nearly five months the hedge of steel has resisted every assault.

"Action in the east has been more violent, but no more final. Austria's strength has been borne down, but the Germans and Russians have alternated as victors in East Prussia and in Poland. There is no likelihood that the British and German fleets will soon be engaged. The air raids on the east coast of England are but ghastly jokes.

"After nearly six months of war, Germany holds most of Belgium and a corner of France. Her colonies are gone, but her European possessions are intact, except for narrow portions of East Prussia and Alsace-Lorraine. It has been shown that she cannot break the Allies' strength in the West; and while she may preserve her Eastern frontier, her most brilliant victories will make no permanent impression on the hosts of Russia.

"There is no reason to believe that the German armies will ever see Paris. On the other hand, to expel them from France, at the present rate of progress, would take years. And, in the event of a forced retreat, the Germans have three massive lines of defense prepared from the sea to the Rhine through Belgium; while if they are thrust over the German border, the invaders will have to storm fortresses well-nigh impregnable.

"From a military standpoint, therefore, it appears that Germany can be defeated only by a wearing-down process—by economic pressure and the capacity of the Allies to increase their military strength while hers remains stationary. The result depends upon the supplies and the handling of money, men and food. The theory is that Germany can be defeated by impoverishment, by overwhelming numbers, or by starvation, or by the pressure of all three. Some figures bearing upon these points will be enlightening.

"Just a year ago a director of the Deutsche Bank issued an elaborate computation of the national wealth of Germany and other countries. Leaving Russia and Austria out of consideration, it was shown that the wealth of France was \$57,400,000,000; of Britain, \$61,125,000,000, and of Germany \$75,000,000,000, an excess for the Allies of \$43,525,000,000. The yearly incomes were computed as follows: France, \$5,000,000,000; Britain, \$8,750,000,000, and Germany, \$11,250,000,000, an annual excess for the Allies of \$2,500,000,000.

"The cost of the war can be expressed in figures, but they are so vast as to be almost beyond comprehension. Early in October Yves Guyot, an eminent French economist, estimated the total loss to the world at \$17,600,000,000 in the first six months. France's expenditures for the first six months have totaled \$1,200,000,000.

"On December 10th Dr. Julius Wolf, a Berlin expert, estimated the cost of the Austro-German armies at \$15,000,000 a day and the armies of the Allies at \$22,500,000 a day, a total of

\$37,500,000 each twenty-four hours. On January 1st the Berlin *Vorwärts* declared the Allies were spending \$24,962,000 daily, against \$21,000,000 for Germany and Austria.

"A careful estimate of the losses in men to January 1st shows the killed, wounded and missing of Germany and Austria to number 3,000,000, and those of France, Britain, Belgium and Russia about 3,130,000. Of those killed, the Germans and Austrians had lost 410,000 and the Allies 475,000.

"These are the stupendous forces that are to be taken into account in considering how long the war can last. Much emphasis is laid upon the terrific drain upon Germany's economic resources. But it is just there that German efficiency tells, and the empire's leaders ridicule the idea that the nation can be 'starved' into submission.

"The German Press Bureau in New York issued a statement recently computing a total army and recruiting strength in Germany of 12,000,000 men. Professor Usher, an American authority, insists that Germany, by making some sacrifices, can live on her own resources. Field Marshal von der Goltz said a month ago that Germany was prepared to fight 'for years.' Dr. Otto Appel, a German agricultural expert now in this country, declares that supplies are so efficiently managed that the people will never lack food. A week ago Lieutenant General von Falkenhayn, the chief of staff, stated that Germany is ready to fight 'indefinitely.'

"It is clear that the political and military leaders of Germany are relentlessly determined to carry on the struggle, and that economic efficiency is a tremendous force at their command. Germany will fight until her citizens realize that the cause is hopeless.

"And here lies the greatest obstruction to an early peace. Of all the peoples involved, those of Germany are the least impressionable by facts and conditions outside of their actual experience. Their patriotism, in the first place, is an exalted passion, a veritable religion, the prime teaching of which is racial superiority and the certainty of Teutonic domination.

"A rigid censorship and habitual veneration for authority lead them to accept implicitly the views of the government, and the official interpretation of events is never questioned. To this day no German, so far as is known, doubts that the war was forced upon them; that the invasion and laying waste of Bel-

gium were just measures of defense, while Turkey is defending Western civilization against Asiatic barbarism; and that the German retreat from Paris was a subtle victory over the enemy. The capture of Calais is still awaited with cheerful expectancy, and the killing of a few civilians with airship bombs is hailed with joy as a terrific blow at the British Empire.

"Those who look for a popular German demand for peace will have to wait a long time. Public opinion is not only uninformed regarding the war, but it is disciplined; and it is inspired by a devotion to national ideals which require the surrender of all individual desires to purposes of state.

"We see no indications that Germany can defeat her enemies. But so long as her armies are in Poland, in Belgium and in France and her people are self-supporting, what reason is there to expect that she will yield? If, then, her defeat depends upon a successful invasion of her territory, it is reasonably clear that we are discussing, not the approaching end of the war, but its real beginning."

I am of the opinion of Powys, who says: (259)

"They fight fiercely, these philosophers of the all-dominant state. And they fight fiercely because, as Münsterberg says, 'In the German view the state is not for the individual, but the individuals for the state' because 'the ideal state unit, which has existence only in the belief of the individuals, is felt as higher and more important than those chance personalities which enter into it.'

"But the Allies are ready to fight more fiercely still, because, from their point of view, there is something higher and more important than any state or any group of states; because, above all state-craft and above all state-machinery, are the freedom and liberty of the human soul; because the liberty of the human soul demands that no machinery, however disciplined and efficient, shall enslave it, and no strength, however formidable, shall narrow the largeness of its hope."

The French Premier, with the unanimous and enthusiastic support of the Chamber of Deputies, says: (260)

"France, acting in accord with her allies, will not sheathe her arms until after taking vengeance for outraged right; until she has united for all time to the French fatherland the provinces ravished from her by force; restored heroic Belgium to the fullness of her material life and her political independence, and until Prussian militarism has been crushed, to the end that it be possible to reconstruct, on a basis of justice, a Europe regenerated. . . .

"In spite of a war which is shaking and impoverishing the world, the French banknote is accepted at a premium; the discounting of commercial paper grows daily, and the totals obtained from indirect taxation increase. All this is a manifestation of the economic strength of a country which has adapted itself with facility to the difficulties arising from a deep-seated trouble and which declares before the entire world that the condition of its finances will permit it to continue the war until that day when the necessary compensation shall be obtained.

"Gentlemen, the day of final victory has not yet come, and until it does our task will be one of great difficulty. The way may be long, and for this let us prepare our spirits and be ever courageous. We have inherited the greatest burden of glory that any people can carry. Already the country has agreed to make every sacrifice that this duty entails.

"If this contest is the most gigantic ever recorded in history, it is not because the people are hurling themselves into warfare to conquer territory, to win enlargement of material life and economic and political advantages, but because they are struggling to determine the fate of the world.

"Nothing greater has ever appeared before the vision of man. Against barbarity and despotism; against the system of provocations and methodical menaces which Germany called peace; against the system of murder and pillage which Germany called war; against the insolent hegemony of a military caste which loosed the scourge, France the emancipator, France the vengeful, at the side of her allies, arose and advanced to the fray.

"That is the stake. It is greater than our lives. Let us continue, then, to have but one united soul, and to-morrow, in the peace of victory, we shall recall with pride these days of tragedy, for they will have made of us more valorous and better men."

From England comes from innumerable sources, the same note of stern resolve, best perhaps shown by Lord Kitchener's grim but epigrammatic reply to the question: "When do you think the war will end?" "I don't know, but it will *begin* in May!"

There is no scrap of authentic information from Russia (p. 336), or from Japan, that does not indicate the same indomitable purpose.

Sweden is said to be pro-German, influenced by her fear of Russian aggression. I have had private letters from Swedes, living in London, in which—but regretfully—they confirm this view.

As to Norway and Denmark, a well-known Scandinavian, Hanna Astrup Larsen, writes: (261)

"The integrity of Norway is officially guaranteed by the Integrity Treaty of 1907, which England, Germany, France and Russia have signed for a period of ten years. Among these signatories, England is the one to which Norwegians look as their especial protector against aggression from any other Power. It is true that they, in common with the Danes and Swedes, feel the warmest sympathy and the most intense admiration for the French people and for French culture, but France is too far away to enter into the political calculations of the North. . . .

"Encroaching Germans have pushed the Danes back from the lands south of the Baltic which they once held—in the thirteenth century, under Valdemar the Victorious—almost as far east as the site of Petrograd. In modern times they have been confined to the peninsula of Jutland and the adjacent islands, and fifty years ago Germany seized by force of arms Schleswig-Holstein, forming the base of the peninsula. In Schleswig, which the Danes still call South Jutland, the work of Germanizing has been carried on ruthlessly. It is forbidden to sing Danish patriotic songs, to display Danish colors, and to hold meetings in the Danish language. Recently difficulties have been placed in the way of Danish-speaking citizens owning land or engaging servants. Geographical names have been

given a German twist. At the outbreak of the war the customary restrictions were sharpened; Danish newspapers were suppressed and the editors put into jail at the very moment when thousands of their kinsmen were fighting loyally in the German army."

These seem significant words at this juncture, coming from such a source.

So far as America is concerned, the opinion has been voiced over and over again that we cannot *afford* to permit a final German triumph. (See pp. 340-47.)

One of the most influential of our papers (262) begins a most eloquent and informing editorial, as follows:

"Germany is doomed to sure defeat. Bankrupt in statesmanship, overmatched in arms, under the moral condemnation of the civilized world, befriended only by the Austrian and the Turk, two backward-looking and dying nations, desperately battling against the hosts of three great Powers to which help and reinforcement from states now neutral will certainly come should the decision be long deferred, she pours out the blood of her heroic subjects and wastes her diminishing substance in a hopeless struggle that postpones but cannot alter the fatal decree. . . .

"A million Germans have been sacrificed, a million German homes are desolate. Must other millions die and yet other millions mourn before the people of Germany take in the court of reason and human liberty their appeal from the imperial and military caste that rushes them to their ruin?

"They have their full justification in the incompetence and failure of their rulers. German diplomacy and German militarism have broken down. The blundering incapacity of the Kaiser's counselors and servants in statecraft at Berlin and in foreign capitals committed Germany to a war against the joined might of England, France and Russia. . . .

"Wilhelm II was wretchedly served at Vienna by an Ambassador blinded by Russophobia, at St. Petersburg by another who advised his home government that Russia would not go to war, and at London by the muddling Lichnowsky, whose first guesses

were commonly wrong and his second too late to be serviceable. Germany literally forced an alliance for this war between England and Russia, two Powers often antagonistic in the past and having now no common interest save the curbing of Germany. The terrible misjudgment of the General Staff hurled Germany headlong into the pit that incompetent diplomacy had prepared. The empire went to war with three great nations able to meet her with forces more than double her own. . . .

"The world cannot, will not, let Germany win in this war. With her dominating all Europe peace and security would vanish from the earth. A few months ago the world only dimly comprehended Germany, now it knows her thoroughly. So if England, France and Russia cannot prevail against her, Italy, with her two millions, the sturdy Hollanders, the Swiss, hard men in a fight, the Danes, the Greeks and the men of the Balkans will come to their aid and make sure that the work is finished, once for all. For their own peace and safety the nations must demolish that towering structure of militarism in the center of Europe that has become the world's danger-spot, its greatest menace.

"The only possible ending of the war is through the defeat of Germany. . . .

"We have aimed here to make clear the certainty of Germany's defeat and to show that if she chooses to fight to the bitter end her ultimate and sure overthrow will leave her bled to exhaustion, drained of her resources, and under sentence to penalties of which the stubbornness of her futile resistance will measure the severity. We could wish that the German people, seeing the light, might take timely measures to avert the calamities that await them.

"It may well be doubted that they will see the light. But have not the men of German blood in this country a duty to perform to their beleaguered brethren in the old home? Americans of German birth or of German descent should see and feel the truth about the present position of Germany, the probability for the near, the certainty for the remoter, future. At home the Germans cannot know the whole truth; it is not permitted them to know it. It will be unfraternal and most cruel for German-Americans further to keep the truth from them, or to fail in their plain duty to make known to them how low the imperial and militaristic ideal has fallen in the world's esteem,

and to bring them to understand that the enemies they now confront are but the first line of civilization's defenses against the menacc of the sword that forever rattles in its scabbard. The sword must go, the scabbard, too, and the shining armor. If the Germans here have at all the ear of the Germans there, can they not tell them so? They have come here to escape the everlasting din of war's trappings; they have come to find peace and quiet in a land of liberty and law, where government rests on the consent of the governed, where the people by their chosen representatives, when there is a question of going into the trenches to be slain, have something to say about it. Have they ever tried to get into the heads of their friends in the Fatherland some idea of the comforts and advantages of being governed in that way? Instead of vainly trying to change the well-matured convictions of the Americans, why not labor for the conversion of their brother Germans?"

Are there any indications that to-day justify the confidence thus expressed?

I have a letter from a friend (263) setting forth some facts that seem to him, and to me, of possible significance. He writes in part:

"My wife and I were immuned in Munich during the two weeks of the mobilization of the Bavarian Army, and we saw practically the whole of this splendid body of troops go to the war. My impression is that they first appeared at the front in the east of France, but shortly afterwards were shifted to Belgium where the dispatches constantly referred to them as bearing the brunt of the fighting against the English and Belgians. Some time in September there was published in the Philadelphia papers a telegraphic dispatch to the effect that certain Prussian soldiers and officers had used insulting language in reference to the Belgian Queen, who is a Bavarian princess. Some of the Bavarian soldiers resented this, and a fight ensued. As a result some Bavarian soldiers or officers were courtmartialed and shot. Not a great while after this it was stated that the Kaiser had said that his greatest wish was that the English Army should encounter his brave

Bavarians. Subsequently it was given out that the Kaiser had said that Dunkirk must be taken whatever might be the cost of men, and the men were said to be the Bavarians. Late in October or early in November there was a statement published that over two hundred Bavarians had revolted, but had been overcome and sent to Aix-la-Chapelle for trial. Nothing else has been heard about these men. About that time the dispatches ceased to mention the Bavarians as opposing the English Army, but mention began to be made of the Prussian Guard opposing the English. Apparently the Bavarian Army had been destroyed.

"About three weeks ago a statement came from Munich to the effect that the chief of police of Munich had posted notices throughout the city to the effect that if citizens were found criticising the conduct of the war they would be subjected to a year's imprisonment. Last week there was published in the *Evening Telegraph* a statement alleged to have been made by a German gentleman who had traveled throughout Germany, that things were in a normal condition, and the people satisfied, except that in the cafés of Munich there was much discussion of the unfair treatment to which the Bavarian Army had been subjected.

"In to-day's *Ledger* there is a statement that ninety Bavarian soldiers, part of the garrison of Antwerp, had mutinied and were to be courtmartialed. Later I read that 'a dispatch to the *Handelsblad* from Antwerp says reports are current in Antwerp of a mutiny on the part of the Bavarian troops garrisoning the city. While the report is not confirmed, it is a fact that the Bavarian barracks have been closed to outsiders.'

"Another report states that a number of Belgian prisoners have escaped from Brussels with the connivance of Bavarian troops, the latter having been influenced by their affection for their former princess, the Queen of Belgium.

"Whatever may be the truth of some of the statements recounted above, it is very obvious that the Bavarian Army has been greatly exposed, and that the soldiers in its ranks and their friends at home have been aggrieved. It is possible that like Captain Uriah of old the Bavarians were put in the front by the Prussian General Staff to be slaughtered. The long political antagonism of Bavaria to Prussia would furnish a

ground, although not a justification, for such action by the military authorities in Berlin."

All this, I admit, is vague, inconclusive, and possibly, as my correspondent knew and said, not even in accord with facts. On the other hand it *may* be an indication of "the little rift within the lute," or, to change the simile, of a defect in the casting, which might ultimately make even a Krupp siege gun a source of danger or death to its possessors.

I note, also, that at this writing: (264)

"Maximum prices for many metals have been fixed by the Bundesrath, such as aluminum, antimony, copper, and nickel. Another disturbing fact is the scarcity of saltpeter and other nitrogenous salts. The government is making every effort to prevent this situation from causing uneasiness in the public mind and recently suppressed an issue of its own organ, the *Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, as well as one of the Berlin military journals, the *Kreuzzeitung*, for printing resolutions on this subject passed by the Brandenburg Chamber of Agriculture. One of these offending resolutions, as published in the *Kreuzzeitung*, runs, in part:

"A great danger for Germany lies in the fact that, in consequence of the war, Germany is deprived of the import of saltpeter. This is a serious danger, because a lack of nitrogen, such as exists at present, causes a considerable diminution in the yield of the harvest; and, secondly, because the production of the necessary quantities of ammunition and explosives may consequently be imperiled. It seems desirable, therefore, that the Imperial Government should take steps to assure permanently Germany's supply of nitrogenous salts."

I also note that *Die Gleichheit*, a Socialist woman's paper, published in Stuttgart, says: (265)

"Like a child's soap-bubble, which bursts at a touch, so has the legend been dissipated that the war would be a short 'mili-

tary promenade' to Paris and Petrograd. We know that we are in the midst of a world-war which will last a very long time, and we must face the fact that Germany for many months to come will remain cut off from commercial intercourse with other nations, and will be compelled to feed her own people from her own reserves. . . .

"Millions of women, children, aged parents, and people in weak health must henceforth rely for their means of existence upon the pittance they receive from public funds and charity. . . .

"The cattle are fed—the poor man cannot buy food.

"Millions are in want; millions more trembling before the menace of greater hardships still to come. In the hour of the greatest danger speculators are profiting by the wretchedness of the poor.

"These facts are officially confirmed. . . ."

An American, long domiciled in Germany, says: (266)

"I have every reason to believe that the supply of gunpowder is causing the General Staff the gravest anxiety. They lack the saltpeter and nitrates necessary for its manufacture. They carefully avoid giving direct answers to all questions on this subject, and prefer to turn them away with some feeble excuse. When asked why they are using old ammunition they say, 'We wish to get rid of it.'

"I do not mean to imply that there are not still immense reserves of ammunition in the country, but from my inquiries I am convinced that, even on a scale vastly below that of the present time, they will, for this reason alone, be unable to carry on the war after next June. I am sure that the most vital considerations of this struggle are Germany's lack of copper and gunpowder, or the essentials necessary to make the various explosives now in use."

Early in the war, Mr. Frederick William Wile denied the alleged "unity" of Germany, which was announced to include the four million avowed Socialists on the strength chiefly of certain votes in the Reichstag. This article

(267) was prefaced by the following editorial statement as to its author:

"At the outbreak of the present war Mr. Wile had a narrow escape from Berlin. Although an American, and well known at the hotel where he was temporarily staying, he was denounced as an English spy, roughly handled, taken to the police presidency, and was in peril of being shot, as Russians and French had been. He was released only upon the summary action of the American Ambassador, Mr. Gerard, and found safe exit from Germany only through the great courtesy of the British Ambassador, who permitted him to leave on the train on which he himself departed under safe conduct."

Mr. Wile says:

"There are sixty-six million Germans. Sixty-five million of them did not want war. The other million are the War Party. That their influence immeasurably outruns their numerical strength is evident from the fact that they not only wanted war but got it. The voice of the sixty-five million was as one crying in the wilderness. It has always been so in Prussianized, militarized Germany.

"No list of members of the War Party has ever been published. It has no official existence. But who compose it and what it has stood for are an open book. The Kaiser would deny the most vehemently of all that he is affiliated with the *Kriegs-partei*. Unfortunately, his speeches are against him. He has talked too much and too often of his martial ambitions, has set the world too frequently by the ears with his blatant apotheoses of Mars and Neptune, to merit the diadem of a peace prince. William II's ebullient son and heir, the Crown Prince, is an avowed adherent, almost the arch-priest, of the War Party. His fellow-members are, first of all, the corps of officers of the German army, a body of 40,000 or 50,000 spurred and epauleted martinets, who have never ceased to pray for war. These gentlemen of the goose-step, through their paramount position in German society, have infected the entire so-called upper class with their belligerent views. The War Party, therefore, includes German uppertendom. It embraces the intellectuals of

the empire—the professorial element at the great universities, the Delbrücks, the Wagners, the Schmollers, the Harnacks, and all the other super-patriots who tread in the path blazed by Treitschke, the prophet of this, Germany's 'final reckoning' with Europe.

"Following idolatrously in the trail of the political professors are the undergraduates of the 'varsities, or at least that overwhelming majority affiliated with the *Corps*, *Verbindungen*, or *Burschenschaften*, the equivalent of our own fraternities. It was these youthful spirits who have had the sacredness of war drilled into their souls in classroom, who ran shrieking, *Krieg! Krieg!*' through Unter den Linden in the feverish nights preceding the actual launching of the Kaiser's thunderbolts on the East and West. In the War Party, too, are the Prussian Junker in his thousands, the agrarian land barons of Pomerania, East Elbia, Brandenburg, and Silesia—the Germans who look upon themselves as the salt of the Teuton earth, the props of divine right, and the monopolists of power and position in modern Germany. And last, but noisiest, are the armchair warriors of the Fatherland, the retired generals and admirals and colonels and naval captains whose very names are a programme and a menace—Bernhardi, Breusing, Reventlow, Frobenius, Keim of the Army League, von Koester of the Navy League, and hundreds less notorious. . . .

"If I thus far seem radical in expression and harsh, let me deal forthwith with the sixty-five mute, meek millions of the Fatherland who craved for peace. For years they have been excoriated by the War Party as a craven, corroding influence, destitute of patriotism, ignorant of 'the real foundation of German greatness,' an element which was retarding the Fatherland in the march to her predestined goal, attainable only by the employment of siege guns and dreadnoughts.

"These mute and meek millions, I say, did not want war. They wanted peace and a continuance of the bounding prosperity which had brought Germany to the pinnacle of economic might. They wanted their army and navy to be that which the Kaiser had grandiloquently boasted they were, and only that—bulwarks of peace, not engines of war. These were the sentiments of the German public up to the very hour war descended upon their inoffensive heads. They cared not a fig for Sarajevo

beyond the wave of human sympathy and horror which wanton murder always produces. They believed, many of them, that the question as to who should prevail in Europe, German or Slav, must some day find a sanguinary solution; but they did not look upon the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand and his consort as the occasion for forcing the solution. It was only when the Austrian demands on blood-stained Serbia brought Armageddon measurably near—made it, as we have seen, in fact, inevitable—that German public opinion, shrewdly molded, suddenly, reluctantly, came to the conclusion that the conflict between German and Slav might as well be fought out in this year of grace.

"I make bold to proclaim that the Germans went into this bloody business with a heavy heart. I heard their reservists singing 'Die Wacht am Rhein' as they began their march to death and glory from city, town, and hamlet. I saw flaxen-haired Prussian maidens tossing roses to guards and Uhlans as they started for the front, from which thousands of them will never return. But everywhere and always I found bearing down the spirit of the German, though only infrequently expressed by word of mouth, the sentiment that the war was unnecessary, cruel, unintelligible, that it ought not to have been."

Another American, Prof. Maurice Parmelee, who holds the chair of Sociology and Economics in the College of the City of New York, has described (268) the impression made upon him when in the late afternoon of July 31, the Kaiser in person announced to the people of Berlin the critical situation. Prof. Parmelee was in the crowd that had awaited for hours in front of the royal palace. He says:

"Finally, at about six o'clock the doors again opened and the Kaiser appeared upon the balcony. After the cheering had subsided, he read twice over in a loud, clear voice a short speech which he held in his hand. The substance of it was that he had tried to keep the peace, but had been deceived by the Czar, and now might God help the brave German army in the fight. After bowing again to the crowd, he disappeared. . . .

"It is impossible to describe adequately this remarkable scene in writing, or indeed in any way. I might say that its principal impression upon me was that of its pathos. It was pathetic, in the first place, because of the trust and confidence these people displayed in their Kaiser. It was evident that they depended upon him to decide what to do. But it was pathetic far more because it was evident that they realized that their country was facing a very serious crisis, and this fact awed and probably frightened them. To keep up their courage they stimulated their patriotism by singing patriotic songs and cheering the royal family."

One of the best known and most influential of American editors and publicists, Dr. Lyman Abbott, still made, after nearly six months had elapsed, a similar distinction between the "leaders" and the "people of Germany." He said: (269)

"This imposition by force of what she considers to be political and social virtue is exactly, it seems to me, the fundamental purpose of Germany in the present European war. I do not mean that the German people are conscious of this purpose; but that the German leaders are conscious of it I think there is no question. One of the pathetic things about the war is that the mass of the German people have been convinced by their military leaders that they are fighting to defend their hearths and homes. They had to be convinced that they were on the defensive in order that they might be persuaded to make war at all, for the mass of the German people are lovers of peace. But the leaders of modern Germany wish to dominate Europe—the militarists for power's sake, the industrialists for the sake of commerce, and the intellectuals for the sake of imposing German ideals upon the world."

After four months of war an American Socialist, Mr. William Walling, rejected the assumption of "absolute unity" and gave some of his reasons for believing it unwarranted. (270)

He began with quotations from the German Chancellor and the German Ambassador to this country:

"In this war social differences have disappeared; even the Social Democrats stand behind us."—*Von Bethmann-Hollweg, Chancellor of the German Empire.*

"It is one of the fundamental errors of American newspapers that this is a war of kings. Most emphatically it is a war of the German people. If any proof is needed for this statement, look at the attitude of the leaders of the German Social Democrats, who are loyally supporting the Emperor."—*Count von Bernstorff, German Ambassador to the United States.*

He continued:

"It is evident from these and many similar statements from the highest authorities that the German Government bases its case largely on the claim that the German people are unanimously behind it in this war.

"Unfortunately, the German Government, which has failed to impress the public of the neutral countries with many of its arguments, has apparently succeeded in this instance. Hardly an important article, editorial, or opinion of the war fails to state or to assume that popular sentiment in Germany is, indeed, unanimous. Whatever doubts existed seem to have been entirely removed as it became generally known that on August 4th, when the war was already going on in France, when Belgium was invaded, and the German people were aware of both these facts, the Social Democrats in the Reichstag allowed the Socialist vote to be cast solidly for the war loan of five billion marks and permitted a declaration which said that they regarded the war as a purely defensive struggle against Russian despotism.

"But if we look into the events leading up to this action of the 4th of August; if we look closely into the councils of the party during the first days of the war; and, above all, if we take note of the position of the party organ, *Vorwaerts*, since the war began, we shall see indications that the German people are by no means unitedly for the war, and that the four million Socialists are split badly on the question. While admitting the

1

undeniable fact that the Socialist *majority* did give its financial and moral support to the Kaiser, we shall discover that there is already a very large minority against the war. . . .

"Even since the declaration of war, under the very eyes of the military censor, and in the presence of the terrors of martial law, *Vorwaerts* has cleverly managed to continue its anti-military agitation. Frequent cables have shown the general recognition of the value of its work, and its anti-war trend has been widely recognized. On Monday, August 3rd, when the Social-Democratic group in the Reichstag decided to vote in favor of the war budget, *Vorwaerts* printed an article condemning German 'patriotism' and the 'patriots' who had suddenly become warriors fighting for 'freedom against Czarism.'

"The article, which is entitled 'War Against Czarism,' exposes the fallacy of this so-called 'Russian peril.'

" 'Russia to-day is no longer a stronghold of reaction, but a land of revolution. The overthrow of the monarchy and of Czarism is now the aim of the Russian people in general, and of the Russian workers in particular.'

"The article points out that shortly before war was declared Russia was in the midst of a revolutionary blaze that was sweeping the country. This menacing general strike had spread until stopped by the declaration of war. The Czarism had been strengthened, then, not weakened, by the declaration of war.

"When Germany entered Belgium, *Vorwaerts* said, significantly: 'Now when the war god reigns supreme, not only over the time but also over the press, we cannot say concerning the invasion of Belgium what we would like to say about it.' On August 30th it had the courage to declare that the Belgian peasants ought not to be 'punished,' as they had been, for defending their homes without uniforms, since the German *Landsturm* was explicitly permitted to do the same thing according to the very words of the Prussian law (p. 301). The real purpose of this editorial, as of many others, was to call the attention of the German soldiers to the fact that they were fighting a war of aggression. In Germany it raised a storm.

"When it became a well-established fact that Italy had decided to break with the Triple Alliance, every 'patriotic' German cried out against Germany's former ally. But *Vorwaerts*, instead of condemning Italy, spoke enthusiastically in favor of its maintaining the position of neutrality.

"When the Socialist leaders Guesde and Sembat, with the unanimous approval of their party, became members of the French Cabinet, *Vorwaerts* pointed out that this proved that the French proletariat regarded it as a people's war, and that Germany would be able to conquer only by conquering the French proletariat. . . .

"As to Sembat, *Vorwaerts* cites his speech of the 2d of August, in which he defined the present war waged by France as one which was aimed neither at conquests nor at the destruction of German culture. This leads *Vorwaerts* to remark:

"The French nation is defending its existence, its unity, and its independence.

"Our comrades did not refuse the grave responsibility of this momentous hour. They felt that the independence and security of the nation are the first conditions of its political and social emancipation, and they did not think it was possible for them to refuse their aid to that country in its struggle for life.'

"Could this be plainer? German territory and culture are not even attacked, but France is struggling for existence. No wonder the *Vorwaerts* office was mobbed by 'patriots' shortly after the printing of this editorial;

"Surely this approval of the attitude of the French, Belgian, and Italian working people justified the indignation of the German anti-Socialist press, which rightly pointed out that such talk was no way to insure success in the war. But *Vorwaerts* ignored the attacks of its militarist enemies—which twice led to its suspension—and for two solid months continued to use every weapon in its journalistic arsenal against the supporters of the war.

"Another editorial that must have infuriated the militarists was that of August 25th, in which, ably avoiding every possible deadlock with the military authorities, the Socialist organ yet succeeded in pointing out that the supposed justification of the war, that it was a war of defense against Russia, had fallen away and that it had become a war of aggression. . . .

"The reader must not get the impression that I have tried to give a complete idea of the work of *Vorwaerts* against the government and the military faction that now controls it. Hardly a day has passed when the cables have failed to mention one or another of its bold strokes, and a reference to the paper itself

shows that it has neglected no opportunity. Repeatedly it has exposed the 'lies' of the militarists. So-called 'atrocities' against the German troops are shown to be either absurd in themselves, or crafty inventions, or grossly exaggerated. German prisoners are *not* being mistreated in any of the foreign countries. In a word, the whole press campaign of the militarists is repudiated point by point. Always, of course, the point is emphasized that the people of the foreign countries are not hostile to the people of Germany. Not only does *Vorwaerts* reject the militarist case in detail, but it also rejects it as a whole—just as it did before the war. The fact that all of Germany's leading litterateurs and scientists have defended the war merely supplies a subject of ridicule; one of the poets, formerly a democrat, is described as writing one patriotic poem every day and three on Sunday, which, we are reminded, makes nine a week. And when Maeterlinck and d'Annunzio are boycotted because they have turned anti-German, *Vorwaerts* ironically points out that the discovery has suddenly been made that they have no literary merit.

"Yet for the first time since 1894 Socialist literature, including *Vorwaerts*, has been admitted into the barracks, and on September 2d special arrangements were made by which it could even be sent into the camps on the firing line. So that the agitation I have described has not only reached the German people generally, but has been spread throughout the armies—probably the most momentous piece of propaganda ever accomplished by any agitation in all history. Evidently the reactionary government made these extraordinary concessions from two motives. It recognized the military necessity of securing the enthusiastic loyalty of the millions of Socialists who compose a third of the German armies, and it assumed that the conservative Socialists, who had secured control of the Reichstag group on August 4th, and those leaders who have been brought into the government camp by the machinations of Bethmann-Hollweg at the secret conference of the previous day, represented the German Socialist movement as a whole. It forgot that the Reichstag members are often governed by political considerations which do not influence the Socialist masses; that the latter have put the control of the party, not into the hands of this group, but in an executive committee composed of a small number of its oldest and most trusted servants, including several revolutionists;

and that *Vorwaerts* depends for its daily income upon the approval of the Socialist masses, especially those of Greater Berlin and central Germany. Instead of a tamed and loyal Socialism which it expected, 'military necessity,' then, has caused to circulate throughout the army literary material which, under the present circumstances, is of the most inflammatory character. For the Socialists, including a great proportion of revolutionists, are already there. All that was necessary was to remind them that all the vast anti-military and anti-monarchical agitation of recent years still holds good under present conditions, and to bring this agitation down to date. . . .

"In the month of June, this year, at the last act of the last session of the Reichstag, fifty of the Socialist members proved their republicanism by forcing the whole Socialist group to remain seated and silent when the President called for standing cheers for the Kaiser. We may be certain that in the end the section of the party represented by *Vorwaerts* and these members of the Reichstag, in large part at least, will remain true to the republican and anti-militarist principles of the international Socialist movement. And we have every reason to hope that this army of half a million, enlarged to millions in the terrible hour of disillusionment and disaster that is drawing near, and taking advantage of the disorganization at the close of the war, may be able to overturn the military oligarchy that rules Germany, and set up in its place that democratic form of government which is the sole guarantee of international peace."

Of course, the world is agog as to Italy and Roumania. I have no more information in this direction than is obtainable from newspaper reports, except as it reaches me in private letters. An extract from one of them (from a land-owner in the north of Italy) must be my personal contribution to this phase of the subject:

"Here in Italy everyone is seized with horror at the way the Germans carry the war with their 'Kultur.' Their great deeds are to fire on poor children and women and churches, and to rob private houses, towns and villages. And yet they

pretend to impose their civilization on the world! I hope and believe that the hour will soon strike when they will be completely smashed, and I also hope and believe Italy will join in putting an end to their behavior and their brutality. The best class of the population in Italy is in favor of joining the Allies in Italy's own interests and honor. The best newspapers, as the *Corriere della Sera*, *Secole*, *Tribune*, *Stampa*, etc., are daily publishing articles in favor of intervention. The women, peasants, socialists (a good many) and the clerical party, are against the war.

"Italy has already done a great thing in not following the Austro-Germans in their monstrous plans. They thought to make Italy obey like a humble servant against her own interests, but they have made a mistake. But this is not enough. Italy will have, sooner or later, to join the Allies, if she does not want to feel the consequences of the present state of affairs. This is my personal opinion, but it is also the general opinion of the best and most intelligent class of people."

But the opinion on this matter that I believe to be more valuable than any other I have seen, was from the pen of Felice Ferrero, worker of Guglielmo Ferrero, the historian, and long connected with what is perhaps the most influential Italian newspaper, the *Corriere della Sera* of Milan.

He says (271) in reference to general Italian sentiment, that Italy has a quarrel and that her quarrel is with Austria, and adds:

"If Germany has seen fit to back Austria in the latter's attempt to sandbag Serbia, Germany must inevitably share the ill feeling that is running against Austria, and eventually take the consequences of it. Needless to say that, acting toward Belgium in much the same way as Austria tried to deal with Serbia, Germany has done all in her power to enhance this ill will, and subsequent behavior has done nothing to lessen it.

"I recall, for instance, a statement made by the Reichskanzler, Bethmann-Hollweg, to the Berlin correspondent of an impartial

Rome newspaper. He explained how at first Germany had been much disappointed over Italy's announcement of neutrality, but had, on second thought, considered it a highly satisfactory procedure; 'because,' he said, 'if Italy had joined Germany, she would have at once been attacked on land and water by France and England, and the war of the Triple Alliance would have begun under the bad omen of defeat.' How is that for a compliment intended to win the favor of the Italians?"

Signor Ferrero discusses the Austria-Italian incompatibility and the reasons therefor, and concludes:

"That Italian opinion is as unanimous as opinion can be in a people of thirty-five millions on this point: war in company with Austria, and consequently Germany, is inconceivable. On the contrary, opinion is divided as to the next possible move—whether or not neutrality should be maintained to the end of the war."

After a further discussion of all the factors involved, his final conclusion is as follows:

"According to our view, Italy cannot, for two reasons, insist on a policy of neutrality. First, for a positive reason: a successful Austria would be the undisputed mistress of the Balkans; would make an end of Italian opportunity to gain the Italian provinces of Austria; would create a disastrous rivalry in naval armaments for the control of the Adriatic—not to speak of the possibility that Austria might entertain plans for revenge. A successful Germany, with a weakened Austria, might be even worse, as it might lead to the establishment of Germany on Adriatic shores.

"Second, for a negative reason: no European Power at this time is strong enough to stand isolation without immense risk, and isolation will, in any event, be the fate of Italy if she does not take sides at all; isolation both because she has not helped the loser to win and because she has not helped the winner to reach a speedier victory.

"In addition, economic reasons now favor intervention. With her army practically on a war footing, it is costing Italy a million and a half dollars a day to keep neutral. Already a credit of \$200,000,000 has been passed by Parliament. Such a burden, without hope of some political return, could hardly be borne by any country with continued equanimity.

"We understand, and on good authority, that Italy has been told by the Entente Allies that she may have all she wants on the Adriatic—Trieste, Istria, Dalmatia, Albania—and even something in Asia Minor, provided she *comes out and takes it*. The occupation of Albanian ports, which preludes the occupation of Albania, is in Italy widely interpreted as meaning that Italy has 'taken the hint.' Certain it is that when her Government decides the momentous step, it will find her people a unit behind it, if not indeed ahead of it."

As I have ventured into this field at all and have in it no shade of fitness for the rôle of prophet, it seems desirable to lay before American readers the views held, after six months of war, by the American writer whose semi-technical war articles have, I think, made the greatest impression upon the American public. Mr. Frank H. Simonds says: (272)

. "Six months after the outbreak of the world war the outstanding fact was that peace seemed as distant, almost more distant than it did in September. Yet if the close of the conflict remained still a subject for speculation, it was now plain that the issue had been determined in September and that all that had happened since the Battle of the Marne had in fact been the natural consequence of one more decisive battle of the world. On fields and hills but little distant from the plain where Roman civilization turned back Attila, the German bid for world supremacy, the Kaiser's chance to play Napoleon were abolished. . . .

"Six months after war had begun Germany was still faced by three great nations, their military force wholly unshaken,

their armies still gaining in numbers, their deficiencies in artillery, in machinery all but made good. Such advantage as her preparedness had given her, the credit balance in her favor, was now exhausted.

"In the same period her Austrian ally had three times been beaten almost to her knees by Russian victories, was now facing an invasion across the Carpathians into Hungary. Twice, too, the Hapsburg Emperor had seen splendid armies ignominiously routed, destroyed by the hated Serbs, who in their turn were preparing to flow over the Danube into Hungary.

"Around the world the German hopes had equally proven vain. The Turk had suffered disaster, the Holy War had fallen to empty nothing, the South African revolution had flickered out as an abortive revolt, with no other permanent consequence than to insure the loss of German Southwest Africa. In Asia her colony had disappeared into Japanese hands, in the Pacific her islands were lost irrevocably, in Africa her remaining colonies were being slowly but steadily consumed by her enemies as one eats an artichoke, leaf by leaf."

"Half a year of war had given history one more decisive battle, for Europe conceivably the greatest in permanent meaning since Waterloo. In that battle it had been decided that Europe should still be European and not Prussian. At the Marne, France had saved herself and Europe; after the Marne the problem was how long it would take Europe to conquer Germany, and in January it was unmistakable that as yet Europe had made no progress."

* * * * *

"Since a war of attrition seemed inevitable, the natural inquiry was in January: How long will it take to reach exhaustion? Again, since it was now clear that Austrian resources were fast failing and new drafts were being made upon German armies to defend Hungary as well as Cracow, the real problem became: How long can Germany continue to meet France, Russia and England with equal or sufficient numbers to prolong the war?

"Early in the war Lord Kitchener had said that the struggle might last three years. What seemed a mere rough estimate becomes far more significant examined by the few statistics yet available, which show the wastage of war.

"Thus it seems fair to estimate that Germany has now in the field 3,000,000 men, France 2,000,000, Austria 1,000,000, Russia 3,000,000. England at no distant date will have 1,000,000 on the Continent. Serbia and Belgium may be reckoned to have 250,000.

"Now as far as Russia is concerned her supply of men is for any ordinary calculation inexhaustible. That she can keep her European force at 3,000,000 for three years, despite battle losses is hardly debatable. As to England, her ability to maintain an army of 1,000,000 on the Continent indefinitely and despite losses is equally to be accepted. It is different with France. Her available military population may be reckoned at 4,000,000. Of this she has already lost 1,000,000 by death, capture, disease or wounds. Half of this number may be reckoned as permanently lost. At this rate, France will be reduced at the opening of the third year of war to 2,000,000. With her allies she will then have 6,000,000 men. But her losses in this year cannot be made good, save by the new class coming to the colors in 1917 and levies from her colonies.

"Now Germany may be reckoned to have had 6,000,000 men available for service in July, 1914; 600,000 more will be supplied by the combined classes of 1916 and 1917. German losses in the first six months may be estimated at 1,800,000. At this rate, 1,800,000 will be removed permanently from the German lines in each of the first two years of war. Thus at the opening of the third, Germany will still have 3,000,000 men to draw on. But her losses thereafter will be definitive, because she will have exhausted her reserve. As to Austria, she has lost more than 1,000,000 already in her many disasters. She may still have 1,000,000 in the field, but a year hence, two years hence, she can hope for no more and her resources, too, will be completely exhausted.

"Thus, as the third year of the war opens not more than 4,000,000 Austro-Germans, the last line, will confront 6,000,000 Russians, British, and French, helped by some hundreds of thousands of Slavs and Belgians, behind whom will stand Russian and British reserves of at least 4,000,000. This means, with every discount for the roughness of the estimate, that sometime in the third year, while Russia and Britain are still able to keep their armies at their present point, Austro-German forces will begin to decline rapidly and a tremendous advantage

of numbers will belong to the enemies of Germany. Such is the statement of what may be called the mathematics of murder.

"For Americans it will be interesting to recall that this is precisely what happened to the South in the third year of the Civil War. Up to this time the South had been able to meet invasion and halt it with numbers unequal to their opponents but equal to their task. But in 1864 the 'seedcorn of the Confederacy,' as Jefferson Davis termed the young men, had been ground up and the end came quickly thereafter. . . ."

"Once more, as in December, the month [January] closed with a German raid upon England, this time by air, not water. With the King's residence at Sandringham as an objective, half a dozen German aircraft,—not Zeppelins, so later reports had it,—flew over Norfolk sowing bombs and spreading destruction.

"But again, as in the Scarborough raid, civilians, not soldiers, suffered,—private, not public, property was destroyed. A wanton burst of savagery provoked wrath, not terror,—left England not fearful, but determined."

As a further aid to an intelligent opinion, if not to a decision, as to the whole question, I may append an interesting review in a recent American weekly (273) which says truthfully that it is a matter which touches the welfare of everybody in America, capitalist or laborer, farmer or manufacturer, employer or employee. It discusses the probable entrance of Italy and Roumania into the war, and the possibility of the starvation of Germany, quoting the denials of General von Falkenhayn and Professor Otto Appel, but quoting also the address to the German nation by Dr. Harms, Professor of State Sciences, at the University of Kiel:

"Do not let a crumb of bread, this gift of God, be wasted. Eat only war bread—regard the potato as a vegetable which will assist you in holding out. Blush with shame if your desire for delicacies tempts you to eat cakes and tarts. Look with con-

tempt upon those who are so immoral as to eat cakes and, by their greed, diminish our supplies of flour."

"Asked how long the war would last, Lord Kitchener, according to a London dispatch, replied: 'I don't know when it will end, but I do know when it will begin, and that is in the month of May.' Commenting on this, the *Brooklyn Times* says:

"It is the most momentous and, indeed, the most appalling announcement of the year. It means that the next four months will be utilized in assembling the strongest forces, bringing forward the heaviest guns, urging the entrance of already well-disposed Allies into the conflict, and such a reign of terror, destruction, and death in Europe next summer, that even the events just passed will form but a prelude."

"From French sources also comes evidence that a long war is expected. In an official résumé of the fighting from November 15 to January 15, issued by the French War Office, we read:

"Summing up, we get ten general advances on the part of our troops which were distinctly perceptible at certain places, as compared to twenty general withdrawals on the part of the enemy—always with the exception of the situation in the north-east of Soissons. . . .

"It can consequently be affirmed that, to obtain final victory, it is sufficient that France and her allies know how to wait for it and at the same time prepare for it with inexhaustible patience.

"The German offensive has been broken; the German defensive will be broken in its turn."

"After weighing all available evidence, Mr. Frank H. Simonds (see p. 474), editor of the *New York Evening Sun*, remarks that 'the three years originally fixed as the maximum duration of the war now seems rather the minimum period in which the end can be reached.' Peace, he points out, is possible on one of two bases: '(1) If one side is sufficiently successful to impose its terms on its opponents; (2) if all parties are so exhausted that peace on the conditions existing at the outset seems preferable to prolongation of the sacrifices of war.' Dismissing at once the idea of a decisive victory for either side in the near future, he goes on to say:

"There remains the question of the value of peace to the contestants. For the enemies of Germany does a return to the conditions of July, 1914, assuming Germany would agree to it,

hold out any attraction comparable with the profit of prolonging the war to the successful end, which it now seems inevitable they can reach, if they will pay the price in blood and treasure?"

"The answer, he finds, in an unmistakable negative. In the case of Russia, 'all that Russian statesmen and rulers since Peter have dreamed of seems now to be had for the fighting,' so that 'peace on the old footing can have no appeal to Petrograd.' As for England—

"peace now means a new rivalry with Germany, who day after day proclaims Britain her only foe. It means that German supremacy in Islam will be perpetuated, unrest in Egypt, sedition in India further promoted from Stamboul. It means that new intrigues in South Africa must follow the return of Germany to her Southwest-African Colony."

"As for France, 'for forty-three years the German shadow has been over her, and peace now would not lift it.' Austria, as Mr. Simonds sees it, is the only combatant who would probably be glad at this moment to make peace, if possible, on the basis of 1914. Turning to Germany, he says:

"Doubtless she could make peace now if she would leave Austria and Turkey to their fates, surrender Alsace-Lorraine, scrap her fleet, give up Belgium, pay the cost of the war, and abandon her colonies. But such terms could only be paid in case of complete defeat, after the power to resist had been exhausted, and Germany is very far from this. Yet it is inconceivable that her foes would now give materially better terms."

"And he concludes:

"Americans will do well in considering the European situation to bear in mind that in no country now fighting is there sufficient desire for peace to make tolerable the only conditions under which peace is possible. This and the fact that from the military standpoint there is no longer the possibility of an immediately decisive campaign combine to abolish any real hope of peace in any future that it is now possible to measure."

"Early in the war Lord Kitchener fixed three years as the limit of the conflict. To-day the best witnesses in Europe agree that it will be longer rather than shorter. Nowhere save in

America is there the smallest hope of an early termination. Nowhere save in this country is there any considerable desire for peace on any terms which are possible in the premises.”
(See p. 336.)

CHAPTER XVIII.

What Can America Do to Bring About Peace?

This question was submitted to a meeting of the Contemporary Club of Philadelphia, an organization devoted to the discussion of literary, ethical, social and political matters. The meeting was addressed by the Hon. James M. Beck, but I have unfortunately no copy of his extempore but very eloquent speech. Allusion to it will be found on p. 371.

It was also addressed by Dr. Stanton Coit, president of the Ethical Society of London. I am similarly without a transcript of his remarks, but I regret this the less, as Dr. Coit, in so far as he was understandable, left the impression on my mind, so far as he left any impression, that he was a sort of attenuated Bernard Shaw, and scarcely to be trusted to present a fair view of the British case to American audiences.

But perhaps it was my stupidity that left me when Dr. Coit had finished, in the mental condition of Alice who, when she was in doubt whether mustard was a vegetable or a mineral, received the following helpful explanation from the Duchess: "Never imagine yourself not to be otherwise than what it might appear to others that what you were or might have been was not otherwise than what you had been would have appeared to them to be otherwise."

My own contribution to the proceedings was, in part, as follows:

The answer to the question of the evening seems to me to depend essentially upon the answers to several other questions which should first be asked. These are:

1. Is an inconclusive peace desirable? Is *any* peace desirable which leaves Europe an armed camp, and which involves and practically insures a continuance of the frantic struggle for superior military, naval, and aerial armaments? Is *any* peace desirable which does not definitely end the power of a neurotic, possibly half-crazed individual, backed by a number of feudal barons, and by a larger number of reactionary, State-fed, State-paid, and State-owned professors, philosophers and theologians, and by a deluded people, to prepare for, bring about, and precipitate upon the world an immeasurable calamity?

I would assume that by the vast majority of Americans those questions would be answered in the negative.

They, of course, implicitly contain premises violently disputed and denied by the pro-Germans, but as they are, in the main, accepted by the rest of the civilized world—or perhaps I should merely say by the *civilized* world—they need not be argued, even if there were time to do so. Nor does it seem worth while to argue with the out-and-out pacifists, the “immediate peace” advocates, the peace-at-any-price people. They can, I admit, at least advance, in support of their position, theories that appeal to many minds—or rather to many temperaments—and that bring to the vision of the imaginative an El Dorado of world-virtue and world-happiness. May it *some* time come to pass! There is no harm in wishing for the abolition of disease and sin and suffering. But if Boards of Health and Courts of Law assumed, as a basis for action, the early realization of the wish, the alienists would take charge of the Health Officers and the Recall of the Ju-

diciary would be the most popular plank in all the national platforms.

2. The next question is, obviously: What sort of peace is desirable?

The answer to this, by Americans, involves a consideration of the principles and ideals of the powers by and between whom peace is to be made.

For this purpose it is not necessary to make fine-spun distinctions as to the different governments concerned, or to ask separately as to the standards of England, France, Russia, Belgium, and Japan, on the one hand, or as to those of Germany, Austria, and Turkey, on the other.

The side which indicted, tried and condemned a whole nation within forty-eight hours, without public examination of witnesses and without published evidence, for a crime—however abhorrent—committed by individuals; the side which, having completed its preparation for war, used this illegal indictment and this unwarranted conviction, as a pretext for the disturbance of the peace and prosperity of the world; the side that has for its leader a "Divinely appointed" colossal egotist—(and of all the mistakes of which Divine Providence has been accused by mortals, this seems the most stupendous); the side which regards war as a "biological necessity," which glorifies Might as superior to Right, which first flouts and disregards treaties and conventions and then tries falsely to explain them away; the side which, in spite of—or largely because of—the tragic befoolment of millions of plain, worthy, simple-minded people, represents essentially a mediæval, war-like aristocracy—that side can never hope to have the sympathy, support, or co-operation of the American people. A peace that would establish as the practical ruler of the world a Power whose avowed intent is to be such ruler, and to force upon its fellow-nations its

own perverted standards of "Kultur," of civilization, of national and international morals, ought to be and, I believe, would be intolerable to this country.

Therefore, the only sort of peace which should seem desirable to America is a peace which shall ensure the dominance and continued spread of the ideals for which the Allies are fighting. Those ideals represent an honest regard for the rights of others, including the smaller and relatively defenseless nations; a subordination of the State to its citizens instead of the erection of a Baal or Moloch to whom all must bow, and with whose purposes, even if bloody and tyrannical, all must acquiesce. They include a conception of adequate and powerful armies and navies, not as weapons of aggression and destruction, but as the constabulary of the world, to stand back of and protect the genuine fundamental rights of nations and to enforce international decrees. These ideals represent, in a word, true as compared with spurious Democracy, the best average good of mankind as compared with the aggrandizement and perpetuation of dynasties, they represent the principles of Washington, of Lincoln, and, of Roosevelt, instead of those of a preposterous "War Lord" with three hundred uniforms and, to put it mildly, a bad case of megaloccephalus.

It would not in the least matter if Russia were ten times the despotism it is, if England were monarchical in reality, instead of from habit, sentiment and convenience; if France were not a Republic; if Belgium were governed by a Sultan instead of by a Hero.

The *principles* at stake are plain to all eyes not blinded by partisanship, or self-interest, or false ideas of loyalty to a strain of blood, or to a fictitious "Fatherland." The sort of peace which places those principles on a firm foun-

dation is the only sort that America ought to desire, and that, I think, she does desire.

3. If I am right, thus far, the question as to what America can do to bring about *that kind* of peace almost answers itself. In a word, it is: Help the Allies.

I am quite aware that such a reply at once antagonizes a great many Americans. It might mean war, and there are those who think *all* war wicked, who place their dependence upon *unpreparedness*, and who, in case of insult or aggression, would turn the other cheek; who do not discriminate between wars of conquest and oppression and wars in defense of everything that differentiates the civilization of the Twentieth Century from that of the Middle Ages. They are represented—at least on the Chatauqua circuit—by our Secretary of State. With them, as I have before said, I cannot argue. They must be left to their slumbers with the hope that the awakening may be blessed and joyful and not the reverse.

There are others, who, with Mr. Champ Clark, say that we must keep out because we do not want to get hurt. But even admitting this as a practical, though somewhat ignoble, reason for neutrality, it at once raises the further question: Shall we, by keeping out, avoid getting hurt? We are hurt already; hurt in our pockets to-day, and in our inability to plan or to provide for the future; hurt in the burden that has been thrown upon us,—and that, I am glad to say, has been willingly assumed—of aiding the sick and wounded, the homeless and starving of the war; hurt in our pride by reason of the evident belief on the part of the German apologists, that we are so unintelligent as to be swayed by their disingenuous sophisms and their clumsy falsehoods; hurt by the unexpected defection of large numbers of worthy fellow-citizens, whom we had thought to be good Americans,

but who in the stress and excitement of war, and under the guidance and inspiration of an unscrupulous German propaganda, have reverted to the un-American ideals and purposes of their so-called Fatherland; hurt profoundly by the brutal pillage and destruction of a fellow-neutral, whose inalienable rights have been contemptuously trampled upon—rights that were not acquired by treaty or agreement, that do not depend upon conventions and pourparlers and signatories, but that date back to the dawn of civilization when the morals of the cave man were superseded by those of the family and of the tribe.

Finally, we are prospectively hurt in that there are many and convincing indications that a peace concluded with Germany victorious, would mean for us either an inglorious and humiliating abandonment of cherished doctrines and ideals, or an era of militarism, and, finally, of war, on a scale even more gigantic than that of the present.

The admonitions of the President as to neutrality, even in thought and speech,—which, if followed, would have seemed to demonstrate that we were a nation of tongue-tied imbeciles—have already been rather widely disregarded. I am glad it is so, because, in times like these, with all that we politically hold dear, with the very cause of Freedom itself, trembling in the balance, it would seem cowardly not at least to *say*, what millions of us think.

But if we really want the sort of peace I have outlined; if we want this war to end with a French France, an English England, and, most of all and with our whole hearts, a Belgian Belgium, instead of with a Prussianized Europe, which would, as soon as it had licked its paws, turn its wolf's eyes toward this continent; we ought not only to *say* something, but also to *do* something.

4. And here comes the final question: . What *can* we do?

In the first place, to recur to Mr. Champ Clark and his

dread of "getting hurt," we have nothing to fear in that direction, unless indeed it might be for a very short time, from the extremists and fanatics among the German-Americans here, who are being called upon to "organize." I suppose that scarcely means "mobilize," but if it did it would not be extremely alarming.

As to Germany, she could do nothing to us without her navy, and that she could succeed in controlling the seas in opposition to the English, French, Russian and American navies, is unthinkable.

We could, of course, not accomplish as much by intervention as if we were, as we should be, in a reasonable condition of naval and military preparedness. But our participation would have the immediate result of bringing about that condition without dangerous delay.

We could at least shuf off largely the food supply to the German armies, and it would not be inhumane if, for a time, we could aid in making the pinch felt by the German people. It might tend to hasten the awakening, the loss of confidence in their leaders, the distrust of the purposes and meaning of the war which will surely come some time to such a people, no matter how greatly their natural common-sense and clearness of vision have been obscured by the false ideals and issues that have been so industriously presented to them.

We could at the same time greatly aid in feeding and arming and coaling the Allies, and for this purpose, the German ships lying in our harbors would be found useful. We could be of great use in patrolling the seas and in rendering fruitless the piratical threat of Germany embodied in its establishment of a "War Zone."

We could aid in keeping open the communications between New York and the ports of such countries as might still remain neutral, and between France and England.

We could set an example to the nations everywhere whose present interests and future development are imperiled by the war. (See p. 370.)

All this seems to me possible, but only by now acquiring the right to be a leader, and not just by "watchful waiting," in the hope of stepping into such a position because of the geographical fact that we are three thousand miles away from the scene of warfare; or because of some mythical, world-wide confidence in the exceptional wisdom and ability of whatever American Administration may then be in power.

We have a number of technical justifications for interference, but, after all, when I think over the matter, I always come back to Belgium. It seems to me that the men who could not bear to see a little child inhumanly punished, or a pet dog brutally kicked, or a willing horse cruelly flogged, must, at least, *want* to interfere.

I admit that in the cases I have used as similes, the actual conduct of the individual onlooker might turn upon his preparedness in size, or strength, or skill, to cope with a bully who was his superior in those respects. But the most timorous would invoke the help of officers of the law, or, in their absence, would be glad to join with sympathizing friends in administering the punishment, which the law would later surely uphold and approve.

These remain my views to-day. In the rapidly unfolding panorama of the war nothing has appeared to change them.

On the contrary, my regret at our lost opportunities and my resentment at the failure of our National Administration to look beyond the commercial aspects of the war have become deeper and stronger.

But, as I have tried to do throughout, I beg to quote another more forceful and more important expression of American opinion : (274)

"General February, that grimpest of strategists, is now in full command of the European battle fronts. The imagination, already burdened by the horrors of war by land and sea, by corpse-strewn fields and blood-soaked trenches, must picture the sordid miseries of a winter campaign—the pitiless exposure, the keener sufferings of the wounded, the unspeakable wretchedness of the millions of non-combatants who are prisoners of despair in the zones of conflict.

"No one with a spark of humanity in his heart can contemplate the struggle without bitter sorrow and a passionate desire that it could be halted. If you had the power—you who read this—would you stop the war to-day? We think you would. We think we should ourselves.

"This war has brought untold misery to millions, and privation even to tens of thousands of our countrymen. The world is sick with the calculated horror of it all. As men visualize the dreadful details of the picture—the screaming shells, the mangled bodies, the splitting asunder of laden ships, the rain of explosives from the clouds, the gaunt skeletons of ruined cities, the tears of women, the faces of children pinched with want and fear—their very souls must cry out for an end to it.

"And yet—what then? Let us look a little at this vision of peace.

"The war, let us say, is to be stopped to-night. A silence falls along the vast battle line. League after league, in the trampled, blood-stained snow, the weary troops rest on their arms.

"The huge fleets disperse; the submarines glide away through the waters, to hunt their prey no more; the winged warcraft circle to the earth and are at rest; the great siege guns still lift their muzzles to the sky, but the black lips are cold and dumb. And the glad message of peace rings like an anthem round the globe.

"This is the end of the fighting. But what is it that we have done?

"Belgium lies prostrate and bleeding under the heel of the

invader. Her people, robbed of their nationality, their liberty and their homes, are suffering cold and hunger and the cruel bitterness of aggression. A wide territory in France has been laid waste, its cities are leveled, its fields and vineyards stripped, its inhabitants scattered abroad or held as helpless hostages. Poland and East Prussia are overrun by foreign troops.

"If you decree an end of the war to-night, is Belgium to be sacrificed? Is all her devotion to be in vain? For the sake of a convenient peace, is her heroic sacrifice to win for her only the crushing burden of legalized conquest and enforced slavery to a triumphant imperialism? Is France to have another Alsace-Lorraine torn from her side? Is Holland to be laid under the menacing shadow of absorption by the victorious empire?

"But, you say, one would not suggest stopping the war upon any such outrageous terms. Possessing the power, one would impose, of course, conditions of a just and honorable peace.

"It would be necessary that Belgium be restored to her people, and that they be indemnified so far as money could restore the hideous ravages of war. France must be freed of the invader and her material losses repaid. Justice must be done to Alsace-Lorraine and to Poland. There must be no looting of territory, whether in East Prussia or Austria-Hungary or the Balkan States.

"Let us imagine, then, that you could impose such a peace to-day—it is really inconceivable while Germany has her armies, but let us concede that it were miraculously possible—would you do it? If you did, you would perform the greatest imaginable disservice to Europe, to the cause of peace and humanity.

"A million men have died, whole provinces have been visited with destruction, nearly twenty billions of wealth have been consumed, the normal activities of the whole world have been checked and disrupted and must remain in uncertainty for many months to come. And all these terrific losses, when once it was discerned that they were inevitable, have been endured as a price to be paid. Now, it is to be imagined, at a wave of your wand, you halt the slaughter and devastation and—except for the ruined lands, the towering debts and the unnumbered graves—conditions are restored as they were last July.

"Not a single question has been settled, not a single principle established or vindicated. Austria's demand upon Serbia

remains unsatisfied. Balkan ambitions of nationality are denied; Balkan intrigue still invites conflict. Franco-German distrust has not been quenched, but inflamed. British domination of the seas has been in nowise reduced. Germany's fanatical faith in her world-shadowing destiny still fires her exultant soul.

"Nevertheless, you urge, militarism has been checked in its designs; the conscience of the world has said, 'Thus far and no farther!'

"True, militarism has been checked, but for how long? Our decree of peace leaves it still dominant in Germany, more worshipped than ever for having withstood a world in arms. Autocracy is still higher exalted, the religion of valor still rules and perverts the faculties of a great people—the most determined and the most efficient on earth.

"And elsewhere, how much tranquility? Are we to imagine the hosts of Russia, aflame with patriotic and religious ardor, peacefully retiring to contemplate the graves of their dead and the barred gates that shut her from the sea? Do you conceive the blessings of unthreatened security enwrapping Belgium, whose wounds a generation of peace will not stanch?

"And do you envy France, war worn and impoverished of her best blood, starting once more up the weary hill she climbed from 1870 to 1914, staggering under a colossal burden of debt, stung by the memory of futile sacrifice, ever conscious of the dark shadow of militarism across her stony path? Or England, facing for unknown years the menace of another visitation such as for the first time in her history has struck real terror to her soul?

"Peace! But where? Peace on scraps of paper, peace in the masked faces of intriguing statesmen, peace in the hollow formalities of diplomatic ceremony. But in the hearts of men, in the souls of nations, bitterness, hostility, jealousies, fear, hatred and the potentiality of unending conflict.

"For, mark this: You stop the war to-day, and you stop it when every nation involved is perfectly assured that it is on the march to victory. Austria has been beaten, but not conquered. The Russians boast that they have just begun to fight. France has proved her valor against an ancient foe, and her soil will be rich for years with the blood of invaders.

"The British have shown such intrepidity and tenacity as the

legions of Marlborough and Wellington, the sailors of Drake and Nelson, never exceeded. The Germans to-day are as confident of triumph as when their hosts were thundering toward the gates of Paris. Stop the war now and you stop it with all the peoples exalted with the belief that they are invincible and need only another opportunity to prove it.

"This and the leaving of the causes of the war untouched could have but one effect. The struggle for supremacy in armaments would begin anew, and would be prosecuted with feverish energy. Arsenal, shipyards and arms factories would work overtime, and every nation would prepare for the inevitable resumption of hostilities.

"When we in this country yearn for an instant peace we are thinking only of the frightful losses, the sufferings of soldiers and the crushing misery of the non-combatants; we lose sight of the fundamental factors in the conflict.

"What is the real issue at stake? We readily recognize a conflict of races, rivalry of empires, territorial ambitions, a struggle for economic ascendancy. But at bottom this is a war against war, against a great delusion.

"Half the world has been plunged into strife because of its frantic efforts to avoid it, and must continue until the monstrous cult has been buried under mounds of bodies that will be an everlasting memorial and warning of human madness. If this terrible sacrifice does not finally destroy war from the earth, then humanity is entering the darkest period of its history and civilization is revealed as a hideous failure.

"Let those who talk of interrupting the war at this point consider the spirit that drives the contesting nations and measure the possibilities of creating thereby an enduring peace.

"To learn the mind of Germany we need not quote the familiar maxims of Von Bernhardt, though they have millions of devoted believers; we may accept the utterances of the statesmen, the scholars and the newspapers, which breathe a faith that sacrifice has only intensified.

"Less than a week ago the Kaiser declared, 'We will stay on hostile territory until the enemy is vanquished or has collapsed.' Maximilian Harden spoke for the German people when he said:

"We do not stand before the judgment seat of Europe. We acknowledge no such jurisdiction. Our might shall create a new law of nations. It is Germany that strikes.

"Just as clearly Professor Ernst Richard, of Columbia University, uttered the thought of his nation when he said a few weeks before he died:

"Germany cannot lose. She will never surrender a foot of land nor an army. Every German might be killed, and yet Germany will not be defeated. German defeat would be horrible. It is impossible, unthinkable. The march of civilization would be halted and its standards dragged in the mire of dark ages.

"We need not quote English leaders; the world knows that that nation has set its bulldog grip upon the purpose to fight while it has the breath of life in it. But read the solemn declaration of the premier of France in the house of deputies:

"France will not sheathe the sword until she has taken vengeance for outraged right; until she has regained the provinces ravished from her by force; restored heroic Belgium to the fullness of her material life and political independence, and until militarism has been crushed. We are struggling to determine the fate of the world—against barbarity and despotism; against the system of provocations and methodical menaces which Germany called peace; against the insolent hegemony of a military caste.

"Or turn to the words of Senator Baron de Constant, one of the foremost of the world's advocates of peace and a member of the tribunal of The Hague:

"Even the most pacific—those who in good faith have done their duty in trying to prevent the war—all to-day would refuse to conclude with Prussian militarism a peace which would be only a lying truce. The present war cannot end by a pretense of peace. It must end by the crushing of German domination, or it would only have to begin anew.

"The judgment of thinking Americans has been expressed by the *New York World*:

"To restore Europe to the condition of an armed camp would not be peace. The nightmare of militarism would still hang over the nations, and every laborer in Europe—perhaps every laborer in America—would have a soldier on his back. When certain questions are submitted to the court of cannon they must be decided by the court of cannon. Either all Europe will come under the yoke of military despotism, or all Europe will be free."

"Peace now would be a mockery. The sovereignty of force would be exalted. Militarism would emerge triumphant and bring under its iron sway the peoples of all nations. The sacrifices of a million lives would have been vain, and this war would be but the overture to a future struggle more bloody, more destructive and more cruel.

"Until the brazen idol of militarism is overthrown and broken in pieces there will be no rest for the races of men. And that can be accomplished only by compulsion achieved through a decisive result. In no other way can an end be made of the barbaric era of armament, not only in Germany, but in England, in France and in all the countries of the war-sick world.

"We cannot stop the war, and it is well that we cannot. We would not, for the sake of the civilization it has wrecked and the humanity it has crucified."

CHAPTER XIX.

What in the Light of This War Should be the Aim of This and Other Civilized Countries for the Future?

A. To this question I would reply in the words of Colonel Roosevelt, in an article on "What America Should Learn from the War": (275)

"What is needed in international matters is to create a judge, and then to put police power back of the judge. . . .

"The one permanent move for obtaining peace which has yet been suggested, with any reasonable chance of attaining its object, is by an agreement among the great powers, in which each should pledge itself not only to abide by the decisions of a common tribunal, but to back with force the decisions of that common tribunal. The great civilized nations of the world which do possess force, actual or immediately potential, should combine by solemn agreement in a great World League for the Peace of Righteousness. A court should be created—a changed and amplified Hague court would meet the requirements—composed of representatives from each nation; these representatives being sworn to act in each case as judges, pure and simple, and not in a representative capacity. The nations should agree on certain rights that should not be questioned, such as their territorial integrity, their rights to deal with their own domestic affairs and with such matters as whom they should or should not admit to residence and citizenship within their own borders. All should guarantee each of their number in the possession of these rights. All should agree that other matters at issue between any of them, or between any of them and any one of a number of specified outside civilized nations, should be submitted to the court as above constituted. They should, furthermore, agree not only to abide, each of them, by

(495)

the decision of the court, but all of them to unite with their military forces to enforce the decree of the court, as against any recalcitrant member. Under these circumstances, it would be possible to agree on a limitation of armaments that would be real and effective.

"If any nation were unwilling to go into such a general agreement with other nations, it would of necessity have to depend upon its own armed strength for its own protection. This is the only alternative. Treaties unbacked by force cannot be considered as an alternative by any sober persons of sound judgment. . . .

"Such a scheme as the one briefly outlined will not bring perfect justice any more than under municipal law we obtain perfect justice; but it will mark an immeasurable advance on anything now existing; for it will mean that at last a long stride has been taken in the effort to put the collective strength of civilized mankind behind the collective purpose of mankind to secure the peace of righteousness, the peace of justice among the nations of the earth."

There have been many suggestions as to the aims of the future made since this was written, but the further they depart from the essentials of Colonel Roosevelt's outline the less practical and the less likely of general adoption they become. It may be worth while to mention the most recent, which is thus editorially described: (276)

"The New York Peace Society has proposed for the consideration, not only of its members, but for the public, a plan of action which seems to us to have much to commend it. It does not propose at present any efforts to bring about the ending of the war. The psychological moment for such action has not arrived. But neutral communities may well consider what should be the conditions of a permanent peace when the present armed struggle is halted. 'A peace which should come by the complete subjugating of either party in the war might be lasting, but it would cost some nation its essential liberty. One resulting from an *impasse* might leave the contending nations still powerful and both able and willing to later renew the

strife.' Neither of these conditions would give a good basis for permanent peace. That can be brought about only by a common reduction of military forces. But such a basis might be afforded by the organization of an International League or Protective Alliance, 'so constituted as to afford to each nation the security for which it now looks to its army and navy. No one nation will make itself helpless while others remain armed to the teeth and able to attack it if they so desire,'—a sentence which we commend to the consideration of those who desire to see this country disarm, or at least content itself with an inefficient army and navy which would render it helpless if attacked.

"Three methods of national self-protection are suggested by the Peace Society as possible, besides that of maintaining an army and navy equal to any that could be employed against the country. We may depend on treaties and on the conscience of mankind for their enforcement. This dependence, the pitiful condition of the Belgians demonstrates to be wholly insufficient in the present stage of moral development. We may depend on an international army to be supported by all the civilized nations of the earth, and employed in enforcing the decrees of an international tribunal. It is very doubtful whether any nation ought under present conditions to abandon its function of preserving its citizens from hostile attack, and trust for protection to an international police which at present exists only in imagination, and it is reasonably certain that none of the great nations would consent to do so. The third plan is the one which the New York Peace Society proposes, and which seems to us well worthy of serious consideration: 'A treaty not only might arrange the boundaries of the states and their colonies, but might guarantee the territories so established against attack either from within or from without the League. Under such a treaty a country whose territory should be attacked by one or more Powers would have a right to call on all remaining members of the League to assist in defending it. This would remove the need of any force under complete international control, and it would also remove the need within the several states of any large armaments. Only troops enough would then be needed in each state to enable it to do its part in enforcing a common guaranty of the sovereignty and the territory of the other states in the Alliance.' We may add that such an Alli-

ance would not necessarily require a combination of all the civilized nations. It would only require the combination of a number sufficient in their combined military strength to afford reasonable assurance that no attack would be attempted against any member of the Alliance by any outside nation."

This, as will be seen, is not unlike what Colonel Roosevelt advocated five months ago. The central idea of each, the idea of securing peace by utilizing the power of all nations willing to enter into a mutual and general agreement to enforce the decrees of an International Court, or at least willing to combine forces to prevent or resist attack upon the territory of any one of the countries so agreeing, is the idea which in some shape seems most likely to be put into practical and effective form in the future.

An analogous plan, developed on somewhat different lines, will be found described on pp. 368, 369, 370.

CHAPTER XX.

What General Opinions Are Justified by the Foregoing Evidence?

Summary.

Reviewing what I have written, and, more particularly, what I have collated, it seems to me that I have given a justifiable basis for the following opinions:

The war is a German-made war, having its source and inspiration in the writings and teachings of the Pan-Germanists; in the ambitions of an autocratic military caste, headed by a highly neurotic, unbalanced, and possibly mentally diseased overlord, with mediæval views of his relation to his country and the world, and supported by a subservient corps of "learned men," the majority of whom are paid servants of the State.

The war in the last analysis was made possible by the megalomania of a prepondering section of the German people, and by the carefully nurtured and fomented desire for World Power.

To bring about this condition the German has been made to believe in the superiority—which does not exist—of his civilization to all other civilizations; in the pre-eminence—equally non-existent—of German "culture"; in the theory that Might makes Right, and that it is only in the course of Nature that weaker—and therefore presumably inferior—peoples should yield their ideals, their liberties, and their destinies into the hands of any nation that by the arbitrament of War should prove itself the master of all others.

As a logical result of these views, at a time selected by

reason of the undoubted preparedness of Germany, the supposed unreadiness and internal troubles of other nations, and the growing burden of the German military and naval armaments, the war was precipitated, on a relatively trivial and entirely avoidable pretext, the other great countries then concerned, England, Russia and France, having shown up to the last moment an honest and sincere desire for peace.

As an immediate step toward the attainment of her purpose, Germany violated a solemn contract entered into deliberately, seventy-five years ago, and affirmed and reaffirmed by her representatives almost up to the date of its abrupt, but deliberate and, at first, admitted infraction.

As a result of this action and of the resistance properly offered, in conformity with the very treaty which Germany had contemptuously disregarded and set aside, the world has witnessed with horror the brutal despoilment, occupation, almost the annihilation, of a brave, innocent, unoffending, highly civilized and industrious country by an adversary whose only *right* in so doing rested on the *might* it was able to bring to bear.

The commission of this crime has been followed by the perpetration of various outrages upon the people of the devastated State, and upon their fundamental rights and liberties. It has been aggravated by lying attempts to justify it, and by even more dastardly efforts to impute breach of faith and national guilt to the victim.

During the entire period of the war, Germany has disregarded, cast aside, evaded, or broken not only many international laws and customs, based on underlying principles of right and justice, but also formal conventions to which she was herself a signatory. In each instance the infraction has been accompanied or followed by quib-

bling, disingenuous, or untruthful attempts to explain, palliate or vindicate the action.

The evidence as to atrocities committed by Germans, either as individuals, or as minor detachments or commands of the army, is formidable, and is constantly increasing in both quantity and directness of detailed accusation. It cannot be said to have yet been given to the world in such form as to compel conviction in the mind of a pro-German partisan. But the list of collective "atrocities," as set forth in German official orders, and as shown by the undisputed occurrences of the war, is quite enough to excite the abhorrence of civilized peoples, and to warrant the widespread and growing suspicion that the charges of the Belgians and French as to individual outrages are true.

Since the early days of the war there has been in this country an organized German and German-American propaganda, which has spared nothing in time, money, or exertion, to bring about a change in the firmly fixed and far-flung conviction of this people that in the war Germany is a criminal aggressor, fighting for her own aggrandizement, for the imposition of her so-called "Kultur" upon other peoples, and for the attainment of a dominating position in the world's affairs.

These efforts to influence American opinion have been conspicuously unsuccessful, although they have been attended by unscrupulous misrepresentations of the actions and motives of other nations,—including America,—by misstatements as to laws, treaties, diplomatic and other procedures, and by venomous attempts to awaken international jealousies and resentments, especially toward England, and next toward Japan. They have been accompanied by clumsy and transparent trials of cajoleries and flatteries addressed to America, which did not, however, suffice to conceal the underlying dislike and contempt.

They have been an unpleasant surprise to Americans, as they have shown that a certain proportion of their fellow-citizens of German blood or ancestry were, in their social and political ideals, rather Germans than Americans, and that their true allegiance was to a European hereditary autocracy rather than to our own Democracy. They have excited resentment but not alarm; have been a source of irritation and annoyance, not of grave anxiety or apprehension. It is to be hoped that they are evidence merely of the unbalancing effects of the terrific strain which this war has put upon all thinking people, and that natural common-sense and kindness have not been permanently obscured by demoralizing and self-glorifying literature and by exaggerated racial sympathy.

In spite of the war's stupendous proportions, the immensity of its scope and area, and the diverse and conflicting interests involved, the principles at stake are easily recognizable.

Germany and her more or less insignificant and contemptible tools, Austria and Turkey, represent absolutism, militarism, feudalism, mediævalism, despotism, autocracy. The "Monarchical idea" is a disingenuous substitute for these terms, with which, however, it is in essence synonymous.

The Allies are fighting for democratic liberty, for representative government, for the equal rights of individuals, whether relatively unimportant persons or relatively powerless States.

So far as America is concerned, Germany and her parasites stand for everything in which we do not believe. The Allies represent—and are fighting, starving and dying for—everything that makes possible American liberty, happiness and independence.

The attitude of the American Government is disapproved

of by large numbers of Americans. Even those who do not believe in actual physical intervention join with those who do so believe, in deprecating a policy of impenetrable silence in the presence of international outrages, and of open disregard for international agreements and conventions, combined with a policy of over-emphasized protest in regard to commercial questions of vastly less real importance.

So far as America, as distinguished from the Administration, is concerned, it may be said that while our technical position is one of "neutrality," our overwhelming sympathy is with the Allies.

Our technical grievance lies in Germany's deliberate flouting of conventions of which we were, with her, a signatory; our real grievance rests on the danger to humanity, to the ideas that lie at the very foundation of our republic, to our own future security, that would attend the success of Germany in this war.

Our duties and our interests coincide.

We should at the very least strengthen the wavering, reassure the doubting, give new hope to the despairing by proclaiming to the world our absolute and unreserved belief in the right and justice of the cause of the Allies, and our determination to see to it, should the worst come to them, that they shall have our material support to our last dollar, our last bushel of corn, our last drop of blood.

But better it would seem to many of us, and in the long run more truly merciful, if we now, on the basis of Germany's admitted and open disregard of solemn obligations entered into with us, decided to cast the weight of our available force—whatever it may be—into the scale. For one, I believe it would be enough to determine the result and save tens of thousands of useful lives, months of suffering to helpless women and children, and treasures of

civilization to the world and to the generations that are to follow us.

We could, with far less bloodshed, and crime, and misery, and destitution, than will otherwise occur, insure a victory for the Allies by feeding them, by protecting them, by reinforcing them, if the war is protracted. We could do at once, and with added speed and energy, what, in any event, it is our bounden duty to do, and put ourselves in condition to maintain and preserve our just rights on land and sea.

We could set an example to all the other neutral nations of the world, and, not impossibly, line them up with us on the side of right and justice. We could shorten the agony of the tens and hundreds of thousands in the lands of the combatants, and in those that are being fought over. We could transform the German ships which are taking advantage of our docks and harbors into purveyors of food and clothing to those whom Germany has first rendered homeless and penniless, and then cast upon the charity of the world.

We could do all this, to consider the most material aspect of the situation, with less cost to the world in life, suffering, or treasure, than would be caused by a month's prolongation of the war; and with so much less cost to ourselves, as compared with that of a possible later war between a Teutonized Europe and America that the present suggested expenditure of physical and material resources would be relatively insignificant.

Moreover, we would be in the position of having in the presence of a tremendous crisis disregarded technicalities and brushed aside the sort of quibbles by which, for example, Germany is to-day trying to justify her rape of Belgium; the position of having taken, for the first time in history, a stand based upon high moral international

obligations. At one step, whatever our present shameful military and naval unpreparedness, we would, by so doing, assume the leadership of the nations, would tie to us in bonds of undying gratitude the peoples whose national aims and purposes coincide with our own; would be able to exercise an irresistible influence upon the course of coming events in the direction of real democracy; would, perhaps, even aid in bringing out of this welter and turmoil the sort of Germany that we would gladly welcome to friendship and brotherhood.

It is hardly possible that, in the final result, the world will permit the maiming and crippling of Belgium to proceed to downright murder; or will submit tamely and permanently to Prussian domination; or will allow the ultimate outcome of the war to be adverse to the side of right and justice.

But it is greatly to be wished that America would—as she well might—convert hopes into certainties, shorten the necessary interval of suffering and disaster, and leave a record for bravery, decision and far-sighted humanity that would be a source of proud gratification to generations of Americans yet unborn.

Our unpreparedness must be admitted, but with unbeaten and valiant friends there would be less risk of disaster than if we supinely await their overthrow, and then have, practically alone, to battle for all that, to us, makes life worth living.

No one can *prove* that such a grim necessity will confront us, but the American who cannot see it as a possible, even a probable and not very distant sequence of the emergence of a "Triumphant Germany" from this war, is blind to the teachings of history remote and recent.

REFERENCES.

1. The Evening Telegraph, Philadelphia, October 10, 1914.
2. The Nation, N. Y., November 12, 1914.
3. New York Evening Post, December 26, 1914.
4. Harpers' Weekly, October, 1914.
5. "Germany's War Mania," p. 21.
6. "The War and Culture."
7. "The War and America."
8. The Independent, N. Y., December 7, 1914.
9. New York Times' Correspondent.
10. "Germany Embattled," p. 96.
11. The Inquirer, Philadelphia, March 15, 1915.
12. The Public Ledger, Philadelphia, October 4, 1914.
13. "Imperial Germany," by Prince Bülow.
14. Prof. Paulsen, quoted by Dawson in "The Evolution of Modern Germany."
15. The Public Ledger, September 27, 1914.
16. The Saturday Evening Post, Philadelphia, November 21, 1914.
17. The Nineteenth Century, September, 1914.
18. Quoted by The Outlook, New York, October 21, 1914.
19. Ibid.
20. Frankfurter Zeitung, quoted by the Public Ledger, February 1, 1915.
21. The Public Ledger, February 15, 1915.
22. The New York World.
23. The Literary Digest, New York, March 6, 1915.
24. "Deutschland über Alles," p. 7.
25. Journal de Genève, November 29, 1914.
26. "Germany's Swelled Head," London, 1907.
27. "Germany's War Mania," p. 13.
28. E. S. Martin, "The War Week by Week," p. 79.
29. North American Review, October, 1914.
30. "Germany's War Mania," p. 18.
31. Ibid., p. 82.
32. Ibid., p. 83.
33. Ibid., p. 96.

34. *Ibid.*, p. 81.
35. *The Public Ledger*, November 13, 1914.
36. *The Public Ledger*, October 25, 1914.
37. "The War and Culture," p. 92.
38. *The Outlook*, December 16, 1914.
39. "Germany Embattled — an American Interpretation," pp. 91, 92.
40. *The North American*, Philadelphia, October 25, 1914.
41. *Ibid.*, September 27, 1914.
42. *Ibid.*, October 26, 1914.
43. *The Saturday Evening Post*, November 21, 1914.
44. *The North American*, February 1, 1915.
45. *The New York Times*, October 29, 1914.
46. *The North American*, January 29, 1915.
47. *The Outlook*, March 10, 1915.
48. *The Public Ledger*, November 26, 1914.
49. *The Sun*, N. Y., January 10, 1915.
50. *The Boston Post*, February 7 and 14, 1915.
51. "The German Spy System," p. 44.
52. The preface to "Fighting in Flanders."
53. "Les Crimes Allemands, d'après des Témoignages Allemands."
54. *The Public Ledger*, January 3, 1915.
55. *The New York Times*, February 7, 1915.
56. *The Saturday Review*, January 30, 1915.
57. *The Outlook*, December 30, 1914.
58. *The North American*, December 30, 1914.
59. "America and the World War."
60. *The Atlantic Monthly*, October, 1914.
61. *The Outlook*, August 29, 1914.
62. *The Saturday Evening Post*, November 21, 1914.
63. *The North American*, January 5, 1915.
64. "A Scrap of Paper," p. 18.
65. *The Public Ledger*, February 14, 1915.
66. "What is Wrong with Germany?" p. 125.
67. "Germany and the Next War."
68. Quoted by Reich—*op. cit.*
69. "Germany's War Mania," p. 256.
70. *The War Week by Week*, p. 214.
71. *The Outlook*, December 9, 1914.
72. *The Fortnightly Review*, January, 1915.
73. *The Outlook*, November 4, 1914.

74. "The War Week by Week," p. 73.
75. "The War and America," 1914.
76. "The War Week by Week," p. 210.
77. *The North American*, October 6, 1914.
78. *The Literary Digest*, November 7, 1914.
79. *The Evening Bulletin*, Philadelphia, December 12, 1914.
80. "Germany and the Germans," p. 539.
81. Quoted by Reich—op. cit.
82. *The North American*, October 6, 1914.
83. "Germany's War Mania," p. 10.
84. *The Times*, London, August 15, 1914.
85. *The Nation*, October 15, 1914.
86. "The War Week by Week," p. 154.
87. "The War and Culture," p. 5.
88. *The Evening Post*, N. Y., January 30, 1915.
89. *The Times*, London, July 30, 1900.
90. *The Times*, London, August 11, 1900.
91. Emil Reich—op. cit.
92. *The Public Ledger*, December 18, 1914.
93. *The New York Times*, December 18, 1914.
94. *The Evening Sun*, December 18, 1914.
95. *The Sun*, December 19, 1914.
96. *The Spectator*, November 7, 1914.
97. *The Evening Post*, N. Y., December 23, 1914.
98. *The North American*, December 15, 1914.
99. *The Public Ledger*, January 22, 1915.
100. *The Literary Digest*, December 20, 1914.
101. *The Sun*, December 15, 1914.
102. *The Sun*, December 18, 1914.
103. *The Sun*, December 23, 1914.
104. *The Evening Post*, N. Y., December 15, 1914.
105. *The Outlook*, December 23, 1914.
106. *The Public Ledger*, January 24, 1915.
107. *The Literary Digest*, January 9, 1915.
108. *The Public Ledger*.
109. *The Japan Times*, November 22, 1914.
110. *The Outlook*, December 30, 1914.
111. *The Outlook*, December 23, 1914.
112. *The World*, February 2, 1915.
113. *The North American*, February 9, 1915.
114. *The Outlook*, February 10, 1915.

115. The Reading Herald, Pa., January 16, 1915.
116. The Public Ledger, January 26, 1915.
117. The Public Ledger, January 28, 1915.
118. The Public Ledger, December 24, 1914.
119. The Nation, February 11, 1915.
120. Ibid.
121. The Literary Digest, February 13, 1915.
122. The New York Times, February 17, 1915.
123. The North American, October 11, 1914.
124. "Truth about Germany: Facts about the War."
125. The Nation, page 376, 1914.
126. "The War and Culture," p. 85.
127. Ibid., p. 88.
128. Miss Agnes Repplier, The Nation, December 24, 1914.
129. The Atlantic Monthly, February, 1915.
130. The Atlantic Monthly, March, 1915.
131. The Sun, December 20, 1914.
132. The Sun, December 23, 1914.
133. Ibid.
134. The Evening Post, December 21, 1914.
135. Ibid., December 22, 1914.
136. The North American, January 21, 1914.
137. The North American, December 4, 1914.
138. The Outlook, December 9, 1914.
139. The Evening Post, November 19, 1914.
140. The Nation, December 3, 1914.
141. The Evening Post, December 19, 1914.
142. The Sun, December 20, 1914.
143. The Saturday Evening Post, November 21, 1914.
144. "Social Insurance in Germany," W. H. Dawson.
145. The Saturday Evening Post, November 21, 1914.
146. Ibid.
147. Ibid.
148. Ibid.
149. Staats Zeitung, October 10, 1914.
150. The Nation, November 12, 1914.
151. "Germany's War Mania," p. 21.
152. Saturday Evening Post, November 21, 1914.
153. Ibid.
154. The Nation, December 24, 1914.
155. The Atlantic Monthly, December, 1914.

156. New York Times, quoted in *The Literary Digest*, January 23, 1915.
157. Scribners, January, 1915.
158. *The Literary Digest*, January 23, 1915.
159. *The Fatherland*, New York.
160. *The Public Ledger*, February 17, 1915.
161. *The Saturday Evening Post*, November 21, 1914.
162. *The Public Ledger*, January 26, 1915 (Interview with Associated Press).
163. *North German Gazette*.
164. Quoted by Chapman; "Deutschland über Alles," p. 63.
165. New York Times, October 11, 1914.
166. *Wall Street Journal*, December 2, 1914.
167. *The Independent*, December 7, 1914.
168. *The Literary Digest*, January 16, 1915.
169. *The Saturday Evening Post*, November 21, 1914.
170. "The War and America."
171. "The Truth about Germany."
172. *The Saturday Evening Post*.
173. "The War and America," p. 43.
174. *Ibid.*, p. 90.
175. *The Saturday Evening Post*, November 21, 1914.
176. *Ibid.*
177. *Preussischer Jahrbuch*, December, 1913.
178. *The Atlantic Monthly*, March, 1915.
179. *The New York Herald*, October 5, 1914.
180. Speech in the Reichstag, January 23, 1914.
181. *The Atlantic Monthly*, December, 1914.
182. *The Zukunft* (quoted by *The Literary Digest*, March 6, 1915).
183. *The Outlook*, 1914.
184. Quoted by E. S. Martin, "The War Week by Week," p. 95.
185. *The Literary Digest*, October 3, 1914.
186. *Nature*, October 2, 1914.
187. *The Saturday Evening Post*, November 21, 1914.
188. *The Westminster Gazette*, November, 1914.
189. "The War and Culture," p. 59.
190. "The War Week by Week," p. 142.
191. *The North American*, December 16, 1914.
192. *The Evening Ledger*, Philadelphia, January 27, 1915.
193. *The Independent*, January, 1915.

194. *The Evening Sun*, N. Y., January 25, 1915.
195. *The Public Ledger*, January 1, 1915.
196. *The Review of Reviews*, February, 1915.
197. *The Nation*, October 15, 1914.
198. "The War Week by Week," p. 146.
199. "Why and How a War Lord Wages War."
200. *The Evening Bulletin*, Philadelphia, October 17, 1914.
201. *The Outlook*, October 7, 1914.
202. *The Record*, Philadelphia, November 3, 1914.
203. *The Evening Post*, N. Y., November 4, 1914.
204. *The New York Tribune*, November 12, 1914.
205. *The North American*, October 18, 1914.
206. *The New York Tribune*, November 10, 1914.
207. *The Public Ledger*, October 26, 1914.
208. *The Outlook*, November 4, 1914.
209. "The War Week by Week," p. 54.
210. "The War and Culture," p. 100.
211. *The Spectator*, London, September 26, 1914.
212. "The War Week by Week," p. 133.
213. "Germany and the Germans," p. 547.
214. "The War Week by Week," p. 139.
215. *The Atlantic Monthly*, November, 1914.
216. "The War and Culture," p. 69.
217. *The New York Tribune*, November 10, 1914.
218. "The War and America," p. 205.
219. "The War and Culture," p. 78.
220. *Ibid.*, p. 76.
221. *The Outlook*, October 21, 1914.
222. *Journal de Genève*, November 29, 1914.
223. *The San Diego Union*.
224. *The Public Ledger*, December 22, 1914.
225. *Ibid.*, January 24, 1915.
226. *Ibid.*
227. *The Atlantic Monthly*, February, 1915.
228. *Ibid.*
229. *Yale Review*, January, 1915.
230. *The London Observer*, January 17, 1915.
231. *The Public Ledger*, January 28, 1915.
232. *Ibid.*, February 6, 1915.
233. *The North American*, February 15, 1915.
234. *The Public Ledger*, February 15, 1915.

235. Ibid.
236. Ibid., January 24, 1915.
237. The Outlook, February 3, 1915.
238. E. S. Martin, Editor of "Life."
239. "The War Week by Week," p. 161.
240. The Evening Telegraph, January 1, 1915.
241. The Public Ledger, January 24, 1915.
242. Ibid., February 9, 1915.
243. Ibid., January 29, 1915.
244. Ibid.
245. Mr. Monroe Buckley—Ibid., January 19, 1915.
246. The Sun, February 3, 1915.
247. The North American, January 22, 1915.
248. The Daily Telegraph, January 2, 1915.
249. The Literary Digest, January 9, 1915.
250. The Spectator, January 9, 1915.
251. The New York Times, February 3, 1915.
252. The Chronicle; quoted by The Literary Digest, December 12, 1914.
253. The Literary Digest, December 12, 1914.
254. Ibid., January 2, 1915.
255. The North American, February 26, 1915.
256. Ibid., February 11, 1915.
257. The Outlook, February 3, 1915.
258. The North American, January 25, 1915.
259. "The War and Culture," p. 100.
260. The North American, December 23, 1914.
261. The Outlook, December 2, 1914.
262. The New York Times, December 15, 1914.
263. Albert B. Weimer, Esq., of Philadelphia.
264. The Literary Digest, January 23, 1915.
265. Ibid.
266. Ibid., December 5, 1914.
267. The Outlook, September 2, 1914.
268. Ibid.
269. The Outlook, January 6, 1915.
270. Ibid., November 25, 1914.
271. Ibid., January 27, 1915.
272. The Review of Reviews, February, 1915.
273. The Literary Digest, January 30, 1915.
274. The North American, February 5, 1915.

- 275. *Ibid.*, October 18, 1914.
- 276. *The Outlook*, March 17, 1915.
- 277. "The German Spy System," p. 75.
- 278. *The Nation*, March 11, 1915.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

In addition I have consulted :

- "Pan-Germanism," by Roland G. Usher.
- "The Evolution of Modern Germany," by W. H. Dawson.
- "Germany and England," by Prof. J. A. Cramb.
- "Men Around the Kaiser," by F. W. Wile.
- "Why We Are at War," Great Britain's Case, by members of the Oxford Faculty of Modern History.
- "Nietzsche and Treitschke: The Worship of Power in Modern Germany," by Ernest Barker, M.A.
- "The Germans" (in two parts), by C. R. L. Fletcher.
- "The War and the British Dominions," by M. E. Egerton.
- "India and the War," by Sir Ernest J. Trevelyan.
- "The Deeper Causes of the War," by Dr. Sanday.
- "The Nations of Europe: The Causes and Issues of the Great War," by Charles Morris.
- "The German War," by A. Conan Doyle.
- "The Audacious War," by C. W. Barron.
- "The German Spy System."
- "What I Found Out in the House of a German Prince."
- "What is Wrong with Germany?" by W. H. Dawson.
- "A Scrap of Paper," by Dr. E. J. Dillon.
- "Has Belgium Saved Europe?" by Dr. Charles Sarolea.
- "The Real Truth about Germany," by Douglas Sladen.
- "The Evidence in the Case," by James M. Beck.
- "The Anglo-German Problem," by Dr. Charles Sarolea.
- "America and the World War," by Theodore Roosevelt.
- "Deutschland über Alles," by John Jay Chapman.
- "The War and Culture," by John Cowper Powys.
- "The War Week by Week," by E. S. Martin.
- "Le Role de la France," by Pierre Albin.
- "Pastoral Letter of Cardinal Mercier."
- "The Case of Belgium in the Present War."

- "The Memories of Belgium."
"Les Crimes Allemands, d'après des Témoignages Allemands,"
by Joseph Bédier.
"German Atrocities in France."
"The American versus the German Viewpoint of the War," by
Dr. Morton Prince.
"Imperial Germany," by Prince Bülow.
"Germany's Swelled Head," by Emil Reich.
"The War and America," by Prof. Münsterberg.
"Truth about Germany: Facts about the War—Why and How
a War Lord Wages War," by Joseph C. Fraley.
"Fighting in Flanders," by E. Alexander Powell.
"King Albert's Book," A Tribute to the King and the People of
Belgium.
"Germany and the Next War," by Gen. Friedrich Von Bernhardi.
"How Germany Makes War," by Gen. Friedrich Von Bernhardi.
"Britain as Germany's Vassal," by Gen. Friedrich Von Bernhardi.
"Texts of Hague Peace Conference, 1899-1907," by James Brown
Scott.
"The War in Europe," by Alfred Bushnell Hart.
"The Fleets At War," by Archibald Hurd.
"How the War Began," by J. M. Kennedy.
"The Mainsprings of Russia," by Hon. Maurice Baring.
"The Russian Army From Within," by W. B. Stevens.
"Secrets of the German War Office," by Dr. A. K. Graves.
"With the Allies," by Richard Harding Davis.
"The Pan-Angles," by Sinclair Kennedy.
"One American's Opinion of The War," by F. W. Whitridge.
"Treitschke—His Doctrines and His Life," by Adolph Hausrath.
"The Great War," by F. H. Simonds.
"Paris War Days," by Charles Inman Barnard.
"France Herself Again," by Ernest Dimnet.
"Germany Embattled," by Oswald Garrison Villard.
"Germany's War Mania," Teutonic Point of View Officially Stated
by Her Leaders.
"The German Enigma," by Georges Bourdon.
"The War That Will End War," by H. G. Wells.
"What is Wrong With Germany?" by William Harbutt Dawson.
"The Diplomatic History of the War," by M. P. Price.

INDEX OF NAMES.

- ABBOTT, LYMAN**—Editor; Author; A.B. New York University; D.D. Harvard, 1890; Yale, 1893; Congregational minister; Editor of "The Outlook." Born, Mass., 1835, 361, 362, 466
- ACEL, DR. ERVIN**—Managing Editor of the "Hungarian-American Reformed Sentinel," and City Editor of the "Hungarian Daily" 160
- ADAMS, CHARLES FRANCIS**—Author, Political Economist, ex-soldier, Railway President, and Publicist. Born, Boston, 1835. Mr. Adams' greatly to be regretted death occurred while this book was on press 194-95
- ADAMS, GEORGE BURTON**—Professor of History at Yale; Historian, Author, Editor. Born, Vermont, 1851..... 344
- ALBERT, GEHEIMRAT HEINRICH FRIEDRICH**—Connected with the Imperial Ministry of the Interior; ex-assistant Commissioner at the World's Fair at St. Louis; Ex-Imperial German Commissioner at the International Exposition at Brussels. Born, Germany, 1874..... 35, 257-59, 281
- APPEL, OTTO**—Botanist and Biologist. Born, Coburg, Germany, 1867 453, 477
- ATHEFTON, GERTRUDE**—Novelist and Story-writer; Great grand-niece of Benjamin Franklin. Born, San Francisco. 134
- BABSON, ROGER WARD**—Statistician; A.B. Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1898; Lecturer in Same on Statistics and Economics. Born, Gloucester, Mass., 1875... 450
- BACON, ROBERT**—Ex-Ambassador to France; A.B. Harvard, 1880; ex-Assistant to Secretary of State of the U. S.A.; ex-Secretary of State, U. S. A. Born, Boston, 1860, 298, 344, 440
- BAROHELD, ANDREW JACKSON**—Republican Congressman from Pittsburgh, Penna.; Graduate of Jefferson Medical College, 1884. Born, Pittsburgh, 1863 245
- BARKER, J. ELLIS**—Author, Lecturer and Journalist; educated in Cologne; contributor to many magazines; Author of "The Rise and Decline of the Netherlands," and "Modern Germany." Born, Cologne, 1870..... 39

- BAERNARDISTON, COLONEL NATHANIEL WALTER**—M. V. O. on the General Staff of the British Army since 1910; served in South African War; has been military attaché at Brussels, the Hague, and Scandinavian Courts. Born, Suffolk, 1858 126, 265
- BARTHOLOMT, RICHARD**—Congressman, Missouri; ex-Editor. Born, Germany, 1855,
204, 206, 207, 209, 225-26-27, 245, 295, 435
- BASSELMANN, ERNST**—Head of the Central Committee of the German National Liberals and of various other public organizations. Born, Germany, 1854 198
- BAYE, BARON DE**—Archæologist and traveler; ex-President of the French Society of Antiquaries; has been in charge of various official Archæological and Ethnographic Missions; author of works on Pre-historic and Scandinavian Archæology, on Barbarian Art, and on Travel in the chief countries of Europe and Asia. Born, Paris, 1853.. 294
- BAYE, MME. THE BARONESS DE**—A well-known Poetess, collector, and leader in French Intellectual Society; her last book was "L'Ame Brûlante," which was crowned by the French Academy 294
- BECK, JAMES MONTGOMERY**—A distinguished lawyer and orator; United States Attorney, Eastern District of Pa., 1896-1900; Assistant Attorney-General, United States, 1900-1903. Born in Philadelphia, 1861; LL.D. (Hon.) University of Pennsylvania, 1910.....35, 71, 250, 371, 481
- BÉDIER, JOSEPH**—Professor at the College of France; a well-known scholar "of high rank, whose business it is to study documents and whose writings are of recognized authority." 116
- BEGRIE, HAROLD**—Author and Journalist; wrote "Religion and the Crisis," "Rising Dawn," the Political Struwwelpeter Series, etc. Born, Suffolk, England, 1871..... 429
- BELLOU, HILAIRE**—Head of English Department, East London College; educated at Oxford (first class in Honor History Schools); Author of "Paris," "Robespierre," "Esto Perpetua," "The Servile State," etc. Born, 1870..... 450
- BELOW-SALESKE, KONRAD A.**—Ex-Minister Plenipotentiary and Envoy Extraordinary to Brussels. Born, Germany, 1866 269

- BENNETT, ENOCH ARNOLD**—Author, Journalist and Playwright. Born, North Staffordshire, England, 1867..... 139
- BERNHARDI, FRIEDRICH VON**—General of Cavalry; Military author, whose works have recently attracted the attention of the world, as foreshadowing the present campaign and the ultimate aims of Germany. Born, St. Petersburg, 1849 18, 156, 198, 254, 356
- BERNSTORFF, COUNT JOHANN-HEINRICH VON**—German Ambassador at Washington; Hon. LL.D. of Columbia, Chicago, and Princeton. Married Miss Luckemeyer, of New York. Born, London, 1862,
93-4, 198, 205, 207, 270, 290-93, 351, 398, 425
- BETHMANN-HOLLWEG, THEOBALD VON**—Imperial German Chancellor. Born, Germany, 1856.....96, 300, 301, 305, 472
- BOEHN, HANS M. L. VON**—General of Cavalry; was "unattached" at the opening of the war; in 1900-01 was on the China Expedition; in 1907 was Major-General commanding in Berlin. Born, Germany, 1853 113
- BRYAN, W. J.**—Editor; Chautauqua Lecturer; and at present Secretary of State for the United States. Defeated three times as a candidate for President. Born, Salem, Ill., 1860 400, 420, 425, 436, 485
- BYCE, JAMES, RT. HON. VISCOUNT**—One of the most distinguished of British authors and Statesmen; at one time (1870-1893) Regius Professor of Civil Law at Oxford; recipient of honorary degrees from learned societies and institutions in all parts of the world; ex-Ambassador to Washington; author of "The American Commonwealth." Born, Glasgow, 1838.....20, 180, 255
- BUCKLEY, MONROE**—Member of the Philadelphia Bar.
- BÜLOW, GENERAL CARL VON**—Recently Commander-in-Chief in Belgium. Born, Berlin, 1846 101, 102
- BURGESS, JOHN WILLIAM**—Dean of Faculty of Political Science, Columbia University, since 1890; educated at Amherst, Göttingen, Leipzig, Berlin; Exchange Professor at Berlin, 1906-07; decorated, Order of Prussian Crown, by the Kaiser, and Order of the Albrechts, by the King of Saxony, 1907. Born, Tennessee, 1844 270
- CADWALADER, JOHN**—Lawyer and Publicist.; Trustee of the University of Pennsylvania; President of the Pennsyl-

- vania Institution for the Blind; Collector of the Port of Philadelphia, 1885-89. Born, Philadelphia, 1843..... 389
- CABINE, HALL—Novelist and Dramatist; Poet and Journalist; intimate friend of D. S. Rossetti, the poet and painter, with whom he lived until his death. Born, 1853, of Manx and Cumberland parentage 139
- CALWER, RICHARD—Author, Editor, and Journalist; Socialist; author of "Introduction to Socialism," etc. Born, Germany, 1868 158
- CHAMBERLAIN, HOUSTON STEWART—Writer; married to the daughter of Richard Wagner, the composer; educated on the Continent; has lived in Dresden, Vienna and elsewhere in Germany and Austria; author of "Die Grundlagen Des XIX Jahrhunderts," 1899. Born, Southsea, England, 1855 36
- CHAPMAN, JOHN JAY—Author, Essayist; member of the New York bar; A.M. Harvard, 1885. Born, New York, 1862.. 44
- CHESTERTON, GILBERT KEITH—Journalist and Author; a wit and a master of paradox; author of "The Victorian Age in Literature," "Dickens," etc., etc. Born, London, 1874 69, 139
- CHICHESTER, REAR ADMIRAL SIR EDWARD—Ninth Bart. Naval A. D. C. to Queen Victoria, 1899-1901; Naval A. D. C. to the King, 1901-2; Rear-Admiral, 1902; served South Africa, 1899-1901; died September 17, 1906. Was in command of armoured cruiser "Immortalité," at Manila, 1898, and was the senior British Naval Officer. His rank was then that of Captain. Born, England, 1849....163, 180
- CHOATE, JOSEPH H.—Distinguished Lawyer, Diplomat, Public Speaker and Statesman; United States Ambassador to Great Britain, 1899-1905; A.B., Harvard, 1852; Honorary Degrees from Harvard, Cambridge, Edinburgh, Yale, Oxford, University of Pennsylvania, and other institutions. Born, Salem, Mass., 1832 132
- CLARK, CHAMP—Congressman; Speaker of the House. Born, Kentucky, 1870 350, 485-86
- COIT, STANTON—President of the West London Ethical Society; educated, Amherst, Columbia, Berlin; author of "National Idealism and the Book of Common Prayer," "The Message of Man," etc. Born, Columbus, Ohio, 1857 481

- COLLIER, PRICE—Author; Essayist; European Editor of "The Forum"; Officer in United States Navy during Spanish-American War; author of "England and the English," "Germany and the Germans." Born, 1860,
141, 142, 176, 177, 355
- CONE, HELEN GRAY—Head of the Department of English Literature at the New York Normal College; an American poet of charm and distinction; author of many patriotic songs and ballads. Born, New York, 1859. . . . 382
- COUDEBT, FREDERICK RENÉ—Lawyer; A.M. Columbia University. Born, New York, 1871. 391, 404
- DAVIS, RICHARD HARDING—Novelist; Playwright; educated at Lehigh and Johns Hopkins; war correspondent in the Turkish-Greek, Spanish-American, South African, and Russo-Japanese wars. Born, Philadelphia, 1864. . . 113, 296
- DAWSON, WILLIAM HABUTT—Educator and Author; educated at Berlin University; married to daughter of late Dr. Emil Münsterberg, President of Berlin Poor Law Administration; author of "Evolution of Modern Germany," "Germany and the Germans," "Social Switzerland," "The German Workman," etc. Born, England, 1860 291-93
- DELBRÜCK, HANS—The successor of Treitschke in the Chair of History at the University of Berlin. For nine years Professor Delbrück sat in the Prussian Diet and in the Reichstag. He was also with Treitschke, co-editor of the "Preussische Jahrbuch." He is now sole editor of that influential monthly. He was at one time a tutor in the royal household, and is a friend of the Kaiser. Born, Bergen auf Rügen, 1848. 158, 169, 260-63, 302, 305, 308
- DERNBURG, BERNHARD—Ex-Editor, ex-Bank Director, ex-Colonial Secretary, 1907-1910; was removed from the latter position (according to Wile, "The Men Around the Kaiser"), on account of his Semitic blood. Born, Darmstadt, 1865. 20, 34, 43-65, 78-83, 90-95, 207, 216, 240, 243
254, 263-69, 270, 285-88, 300, 304-307, 317, 350
- DEVOY, JOHN—Editor of "The Gaelic American," New York; has been prominent in the Fenian movement; at present a leader of the Clan-na-Gael 245
- DEWEY, GEORGE—Admiral of the Navy, U. S. A.; a graduate of United States Naval Academy, 1858; LL.D. University

- of Pennsylvania, and Princeton, 1898; saw service all through the Civil War; in command of Asiatic Squadron, May 1, 1898, at Battle of Manila Bay where the Spanish Asiatic Squadron was completely annihilated, without the loss of a man on the American side. Born, Montpelier, Vermont, 1837 163, 164
- DICKINSON, G. LOWES—Publicist; Fellow and Lecturer King's College, Cambridge; educated at Cambridge; Lecturer in the London School of Economics and Political Science; author of "Letters of a Chinese Official," "A Modern Symposium," etc. Born, England 210
- DICKSON, SAMUEL—Lawyer; one of the leaders of the Philadelphia Bar; Trustee of the University of Pennsylvania. Born, Newburgh, N. Y., 1837 390
- DIEDERICHS, ADMIRAL OTTO VON—Ex-Staff Officer of the German Marine; Admiral in January, 1902; put on "unattached list" November, 1902. Born, Minden, 1843....163, 180
- DILLON, EMILE JOSEPH—Noted correspondent of the London "Daily Telegraph"; educated Collège de France, Paris; universities of Innsbruck, Leipzig, Tübingen, etc.; various degrees from St. Petersburg, Louvain, Kharkoff; author of numerous books in English and Russian. Born, Ireland 71, 147
- DISFUETH VON—Major-General; recently commanding Tenth Brigade of Infantry 42, 200, 280, 309
- DOYLE, SIR ARTHUR CONAN—Novelist; M.D. Edinburgh; author of "The Memories of Sherlock Holmes," "The Great Boer War," etc.; son of Charles Doyle, artist, and nephew of Richard Doyle of "Punch." Born, Edinburgh, 1859 139
- DRAKE, HERBERT ARMITAGE—Lawyer, of Camden, N. J., U. S. A. 366
- DRYANDER, ERNST—Theologian; author of various works on religion and on the Gospels. Born, Halle, 1843 198
- ELIOT, CHARLES—Mathematician, chemist, scientist, educator; President of Harvard University 1869-1909; now President Emeritus. Born, Boston, 1834 196, 343
- EUCKEN, PROFESSOR RUDOLF CHRISTIAN—Ethical and religious writer; doctor of laws, letters and philosophy. Born in East Friesland, 1846 198, 243

- FALKENHAYN, LIEUTENANT-GENERAL ERICH, G. A. S., VON—
Ex-War Minister; successor to von Moltke as Chief of
the General Staff; ex-instructor of the Crown Prince;
was on the staff of Count von Waldersee during the
Boxer rebellion; "as Minister of War he was uncompromising
in his support of the officers whose policy in
Alsace precipitated the Zabern disorders." Born, Ger-
many, 1862 310, 453, 477
- FAUST, ALBERT B.—Author; Professor of German in Cornell
University. Born, Baltimore, Md., 1870 245
- FERRERO, FELICE—Italian journalist; brother of Guglielmo
Ferrero, the historian 472
- FERRERO, GUGLIELMO—The Italian historian of the Roman
Republic and Empire 356, 450
- FRALEY, JOSEPH C.—Lawyer, with national reputation as
specialist in the laws of patents; graduate of Univer-
sity of Pennsylvania. Born, Philadelphia 79, 90, 171, 341
- FRANCKE, KUNO—Professor of History of German Culture,
Harvard, since 1896, and since 1902 Curator Germanic
Museum, Harvard; Chevalier Royal Prussian Order Red
Eagle. Born, Germany, 1855 174, 231
- FRENCH, FIELD MARSHAL SIR JOHN DENTON PINKSTONE—
Son of Captain French, R. N.; entered British Navy at
age of 14; served as naval cadet and midshipman for four
years; entered army in 1874; served in the Soudan cam-
paign and in South African War. Born, Kent, Eng-
land, 1852 20
- FULDA, LUDWIG—Doctor of Philosophy; educated at Frank-
fort-on-the-Main; studied at Heidelberg, Berlin and
Leipzig, 1880-83. Born, Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1862.. 298
- FULLER, PAUL—A member of the well-known legal firm of
Coudert Brothers, in New York; a recognized authority
upon questions of international law 385
- FULLERTON, GEORGE STUART—Author; Professor of Philosophy
in Columbia University since 1904; ex-Vice Provost of
the University of Pennsylvania. Born, India, 1859 196
- FURNESS, WILLIAM HENRY, 3RD—Author; physician; traveler;
explorer; A.B., Harvard, 1888; M.D., University of Penn-
sylvania, 1891; son of Horace Howard Furness, the
Shakespearean author. Born, Wallingford, Pa., 1866... 219

- GOLTZ, FIELD MARSHAL BARON VON DER**—Appointed Military Governor of Belgium, August 27, 1914; took command immediately; a native of East Prussia; sent to reorganize the Turkish Army, 1883-96; writer on military subjects; relieved of Belgian duty in November, 1914, and sent to Constantinople; it is thought by many critics that the performance of the Turkish Army during the Balkan wars did not reflect much credit upon him; nevertheless, in Germany, he is said to be regarded as one of the greatest of their strategists. Born, Germany, 1843...103, 453
- GOSCHEN, RT. HON. SIR WILLIAM EDWARD**—British Ambassador at Berlin since 1908; educated at Rugby and Oxford; has been in the British diplomatic service since 1869, serving in various capacities at Madrid, Buenos Ayres, Rio de Janeiro, Constantinople, Pekin, Copenhagen, Lisbon, Washington, St. Petersburg, Belgrade and Vienna. Born, England, 1847 91
- GREY, RT. HON. SIR EDWARD**—British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs since 1905; educated at Winchester and Oxford; was Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, 1892-95; member Parliament (Liberal) for Berwick-on-Tweed since 1885. Born, England, 1862...91, 250, 252, 268
- GROSSCUP, PETER STEWART, JUDGE**—Educated Wittenberg College. Born, Ohio, 1852 270
- GUILD, CURTIS**—Journalist, ex-soldier, ex-Ambassador to Mexico, ex-Ambassador to Russia; A.B. (*summa cum laude*), Harvard, 1881. Born, Boston, 1860 412, 440
- GUYOT, YVES**—A distinguished French publicist and writer on statistical, political and economic subjects. Born, Dinan, 1843 452
- GWINNER, ARTHUR VON**—Director of the Deutschen Bank. Born, Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1856 198
- HÆCKEL, PROFESSOR ERNST**—Biologist and Scientist; author of noteworthy books on evolution and on many branches of zoology. Born, Potsdam, Germany, 1834...26, 27, 198, 304
- HALE, WILLIAM GARDNER**—Professor of Latin, University of Chicago; A.B., Harvard, 1870; LL.D., Princeton, St. Andrew's and Aberdeen; distinguished philologist. Born, Savannah, 1849 347, 357
- HALL, THOMAS C.**—Theologian; Professor of Christian Ethics at Union Theological Seminary, N. Y.; A.B.,

- Princeton, 1879; studied at Berlin and Göttingen, 1882
83; ordained to the Presbyterian Ministry, 1883; pos-
sessor of the "Order of the Crown," third class, by gift
of the Kaiser. Born, Armagh, Ireland, 1858 295,-96
- HAPGOOD, NORMAN—A distinguished American author and
litterateur; was editor "Collier's Weekly" from 1903 to
1912; is now editor of "Harper's Weekly." Born, Amer-
ica, 1868 20
- HARDEN, MAXIMILIAN—Editor of the "Zukunft." It was he
who in 1907 exposed the degeneracy of Count Philip zu
Eulenberg, sometime German Ambassador at Vienna and
an intimate friend of the Kaiser; "When Harden was
proscribed for his audacity in attacking one of the Em-
peror's friends, he forced the prosecution to withdraw
by stating that he had enough correspondence in his pos-
session to ruin the reputation of the members of the Im-
perial Family and half the officers of the Imperial
Guards." (277) Born, Berlin, 1861 200-01, 270, 304
- HARMS, BERNHARD—Professor of State Science at the Univer-
sity of Kiel; voluminous writer upon social, statistical
and industrial problems. Born, Hanover, 1876 477
- HARNACK, ADOLF—Professor, Theologian, Philosopher, Hono-
rary Doctor of Laws and Medicine; prolific writer. Born,
Dorpat, 1851 198, 244, 464
- HART, ALBERT BUSHNELL—Former Professor of History, now
Professor of Government, Harvard University; A.B., Har-
vard, 1880; Ph.D., Freiburg, Baden, 1883; editor and
author of many historical text-books and essays. Born,
Clarksville, Pennsylvania, 1854 437
- HAUPTMANN, GERHART—Poet; educated in the Breslau Kunst-
schule and later at the Universities of Jena and Berlin.
Born, Germany, 1862 23, 68, 301
- HEARST, WILLIAM RANDOLPH—Newspaper publisher; owns, or
has owned, the San Francisco "Examiner," the New York
"Journal," the New York "Morning American," the Chi-
cago "American," the Chicago "Morning Examiner," the
Boston "American," the Los Angeles "Examiner"; ex-
President National League of Democratic Clubs. Born,
San Francisco, 1863 425
- HENRY, ALBERT WILLIAM—Prince of Prussia; brother of the
Kaiser; a strong advocate of the increase of German sea

- power; sent to this country by the Kaiser in 1902, on the occasion of the launching of a yacht built here for the latter. Born, Potsdam, 1862 141, 164
- HEXAMER, CHARLES JOHN**—Civil Engineer and insurance agent; B.S., University of Pennsylvania, 1882, A.M., 1884; decorated by Emperor of Germany with Order of Red Eagle "for services in diffusing German culture in America." Born, Philadelphia, 1862 176, 227, 245
- HIBBEN, JOHN GRIER**—President of Princeton University; minister of the Presbyterian Church; author of treatises on Logic and Philosophy. Born, Peoria, Ill., 1861..... 244
- HILPRECHT, HERMAN VOLRATH**—Was Professor of Assyriology and Curator of the Semitic Section of the University of Pennsylvania, 1886-1911. Born in Germany, 1859.35, 250, 251
- HITCHCOCK, GILBERT**—United States Senator from Nebraska; Educated in public schools and in Germany. Born, Omaha, 1859 432
- HOLLEBEN, DR. THEODORE VON**—Envoy and Minister to various countries, including the United States. Born, Stettin, Germany, 1838 164, 166
- HOWE, HENRY M.**—Professor of Metallurgy, Columbia University; gold medallist in various countries. Born, Boston, 1848 345
- HOWELLS, WILLIAM DEAN**—One of the most admired and respected of living American authors; formerly editor of "The Atlantic Monthly;" now writer of "Editor's Easy Chair," Harper's; ex-President of the American Academy of Arts and Letters; ex-United States Consul to Venice. Born, Martin Ferry, Ohio, 1837 53, 133, 416
- JAGEMANN, HANS CARL GUNTHER**—Professor of Germanic Philology, Harvard; educated at Universities of Leipzig and Tübingen; Ph.D., Johns Hopkins, 1884. Born, Germany, 1859 35
- JAGOW, GOTTLIEB VON**—German Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. Born, Berlin, 1863 310, 394
- JASTROW, MORRIS, JR.**—Born in Poland, 1861. Professor of Semitic Languages and Librarian, University of Pennsylvania; A.B., University of Pennsylvania, 1881; Ph.D., University of Leipzig, 1884....18, 32, 90, 238-42, 282-83, 306
- JORDAN, DAVID STARR**—Biologist; University Professor; Presi-

- dent of Leland Stanford, Jr., University since 1891.
Born, Gainesville, New York, 1851 120
- JUNGE, FRANZ—Engineer; Ph.D. of Erlanger; student of philosophy and political science at the Universities of Berlin and Heidelberg; he is in this country partly "to negotiate with the United States Navy Department for the equipment of American submarines with German oil-engines of a new type" 160
- KIRBACH, HUGO—Recording Secretary of the "German University League," New York 220
- KITCHENER OF KHARTUM, VISCOUNT HORATIO HERBERT—British Secretary of State for War; educated at Royal Military Academy, Woolwich; entered Royal Engineers, 1871; commander in chief on many important occasions, *e. g.*, the Dongola Expeditionary Force, 1896; Khartum Expedition, 1898; South Africa, 1900; India, 1902-09, etc. Born, County Kerry, Ireland, 1850 450, 478
- KLAUSSMANN, ANTON OSKAR—Writer under many pseudonyms. Born, Breslau, 1851 202
- LA FOLLETTE, ROBERT MARION—United States Senator from Wisconsin, term expires 1917; ex-Governor of Wisconsin. Born, Wisconsin, 1855 441
- LAMPRECHT, PROFESSOR KARL G—Political Economist and Historian. Born, Germany, 1856 198
- LANG, WILLIAM ROBERT—Professor of Chemistry, University of Toronto; B.Sc., University of Glasgow; author of various papers on chemical subjects 240
- LANGE, FRIEDRICH—Author, Editor, Doctor of Philosophy. Born, Germany, 1852 37
- LANKESTER, SIR EDWIN RAY—Emeritus Professor of Zoology and Comparative Anatomy in the University of London; voluminous and effective writer upon biological subjects; honorary member of numerous learned societies in all parts of the world. Born, England, 1847 330
- LARKIN, JAMES—Irish socialist and labor leader; was leader of the Dublin strike, 1913-14; is a social revolutionist; has spent most of his efforts trying to organize the unskilled; now lecturing in United States, sometimes to socialists and at other times under the auspices of the *Clan-Na-Gael* 190-91

- LASSON, PROFESSOR ADOLF**—Doctor of Theology, Laws, Letters; Privy Councillor; Honorary Professor of Philosophy, University of Berlin. Born, Germany, 1832....
44, 96, 199, 229, 306, 307
- LEACOCK, STEPHEN BUTLER**—Author, Lecturer and Humorist; educated at University of Toronto; Ph.D., University of Chicago. Born, Hants, England, 1869 59
- LENARD, PHILIPP**—Professor of Physics, University of Heidelberg. Born, Pozsony, 1862 51, 200, 309
- LENTZ, JOHN JACOB**—Lawyer; was appointed trustee of Ohio University by Governor McKinley; member of Congress, ..
1897-1901, Twelfth Ohio District, Democrat; prominent as advocate of armed intervention in Cuba in debates preceding war of 1898. Born, Ohio, 1856 165
- LEON, MAURICE**—Lawyer, Writer; educated in Paris and New York by stepfather, Prof. J. H. Gottheil, of Columbia University; admitted to New York Bar, February, 1903. Born, Beirut, Syria, 1880 204, 206, 215-16
- LEYEN, PROF. ALFRED VON**—University of Berlin; well-known authority on engineering, and on railway management and railway policy; author of "Financial and Traffic Policies of the Railways of North America." Born, Germany, 1844 43
- LEZIUS, PROFESSOR FRIEDRICH**, of Königsberg—Theologian. Born, Livonia, 1859 38
- LICHNOWSKY, PRINCE KARL MAX**—German Ambassador at London, 1914. Born, Germany, 1860
- LISSAUER, ERNST**—Author of "Hassgesang gegen England"—the "Chant of Hate." The following interesting history of this now celebrated song is given by Archibald Henderson: (278) "In anticipation of a coming fierce conflict with a division of the British army, the Crown Prince Rupprecht of Bavaria issued to his troops two army orders, 'calling upon them to fight with especial bitterness and force against the English troops' (these army orders were cited by the 'Basler Nachrichten,' one of the leading German newspapers of Switzerland). The spirit of these army orders made such a profound and moving impression upon Ernst Lissauer, a trooper in the Tenth Regiment of Bavarian Infantry, that he was inspired to

- write his flaming protest as an expression of the deepest popular feeling. (Cf. Politische Beilage der Leipziger Neuesten Nachrichten, Nr. 310, 2, Beilage, November 9, 1914.) Realizing the tremendous stimulative value of the poem as a war-song, Crown Prince Rupprecht pursued the striking course of issuing the 'Hassgesang gegen England' as a special army order to his troops."..... 307
- LOBECK, CHARLES O.—Congressman, Nebraska; educated at the Baldwin Wallace College, Berea, Ohio; Business College of Chicago; commercial traveller, etc. Born, Illinois, 1852 204, 206, 245
- LODGE, HENRY CABOT—United States Senator from Massachusetts since 1893; editor; author; historian. An Overseer of Harvard since 1911. Born, Boston, 1850....407, 412
- LONDON, JACK—Author; journalist; lecturer; war correspondent Russo-Japanese War. Born, San Francisco, 1876... 133
- LOVEJOY, ARTHUR O.—Professor of Philosophy, Johns Hopkins University; A.B., University of California, 1895; A.M., Harvard, 1897, University of Paris, 1899. Born, Berlin, Germany, 1873 242, 251-253
- LOWELL, ABBOTT LAWRENCE—President of Harvard University; author of "Essays on Government," "The Government of England," etc. Born, Boston, 1856..... 153
- LUETWITZ, BARON VON—General commanding a district of Belgium during the fall and winter of 1914 103
- MACDONALD, JAMES RAMSAY—M. P. (Labor) for Leicester, since 1906; leader of the Labor Party, 1911; author of "Socialism and Society," "Socialism and Government," etc. Born, Lossiemouth, Scotland, 1866 181
- MCLEOY, ROBERT N.—Professor of American History, Princeton University; studied at Leipzig, Berlin and Oxford. Born, Kentucky, 1872 141
- MACH, DR. EDMUND VON—Lecturer; Editor; Writer on Painting and Sculpture and on their history; served in Germany Army, 1889-91; came to America, 1891; A.M., Harvard, 1896, Ph.D., 1900. Born, Pomerania, 1870... 35, 109, 168, 245, 281
- MARTIN, EDWARD SANDFORD—Author and Essayist; A.B., Harvard, 1877; member of Bar, Rochester, N. Y.; editor of "Life." Born, Willowbrook, N. Y., 1856, ... 159, 174, 184, 352, 354, 355, 409

- MARTIN, RUDOLF EMIL**—Ex-Minister of the Interior; author of many works on economic and industrial subjects; also of "Kaiser Wilhelm II und König Eduard VII." "Germany's Future" (1908), etc. Born, Saxony, 1867. 27, 304
- MATTHEWS, BRANDEE**—Author; Professor of Dramatic Literature, Columbia University; A.B., Columbia, 1871; Litt.D., Yale, 1901; LL.D., Columbia, 1904. Born, New Orleans, 1852 313
- MENCKEN, HENRY LOUIS**—Journalist; Critic; and Editor; author, after many years of careful study, of "The Philosophy of Friedrich Nietzsche," "The Gist of Nietzsche," etc. Born, Baltimore, 1880 140
- MERCIEB, CHARLES ARTHUR**—Noted psychiatrist; examiner in mental diseases at the London University; author of "Text-book of Insanity," "Criminal Responsibility," etc. Born, England, 1852 330
- METZ, EDUARD**—Professor of History, University of Berlin; formerly an Exchange Professor at Harvard (1909); author of many historical works. Born, Hamburg, 1855 240
- MEYER, KUNO E.**—Professor of the Celtic Language and Literature at the University of Berlin; formerly of Liverpool and of Dublin. Born, Hamburg, 1858 191-92
- MOLTKE, HELMUTH JOHANNES LUDWIG VON**—Recently Chief of the German General Staff. Born, Germany, 1848. 73
- MORGAN, JOHN HAETMAN**—Professor of Constitutional Law at University College, London, since 1908; educated at Oxford and Berlin; has been on literary staff of "The Daily Chronicle" and leader writer for "The Manchester Guardian;" author of many books on constitutional law. Born, Wales, 1876 122
- MUIBHEAD, JAMES FULLARTON**—Editor and Author; the compiler of Baedeker's "United States," "Great Britain," etc., and the editor of many of the English editions of Baedeker's hand-books; author of "The House of Baedeker," "Baedeker in the Making," "America, the Land of Contrasts." Born, Glasgow, 1853 337-40
- MUMM, DR. A. VON**—Chargé d'Affaires at the German Embassy in Washington, 1891 164
- MÜNSTERBERG, HUGO**—Professor of Psychology and Director of the Psychological Laboratory at Harvard University;

- Harvard Exchange Professor at Berlin, 1910-11. Born, Dantzig, Germany, 1863..17, 174, 181-86, 198, 254, 281, 302, 305, 306, 359-60, 375
- NAUMANN, FRIEDRICH, D.D.—Editor of "Hilfe," Berlin; voluminous writer. Born, Störmthal, 1860.....200, 309
- NEWBOLD, CLEMENT B.—Banker, Philadelphia..... 426
- NIEBER, LIEUTENANT-GENERAL STEPHEN VON—Born, Germany, 1855 102
- OBERHOLTZER, ELLIS PAXSON—Author; editor; journalist; educated at University of Pennsylvania and German universities; was a student of Von Treitschke years ago in Berlin; a newspaper correspondent there while he attended the German universities; wrote and published in German a work on the relations existing between the Government and the newspaper press in Germany. Born, Philadelphia, 1868 148-54
- OSTWALD, DR. WILHELM—Chemist; Professor University of Leipzig; Nobel Prize winner 45, 243, 361
- PARMELEE, MAURICE—Sociologist; Assistant Professor of Sociology, University of Missouri; A.B., Yale, 1904; Ph.D., Columbia, 1909; author of "The Principles of Anthropology and Sociology in their Relations to Criminal Procedure." Born, Constantinople, Turkey, 1882.. 465
- PAULSEN, FRIEDRICH—Professor of Philosophy in the University of Berlin 279-80
- PENNYPACKER, SAMUEL WHITAKER—Ex-Judge of Common Pleas, Philadelphia; ex-Governor of Pennsylvania; Trustee of the University of Pennsylvania; voluminous writer on legal and historical subjects; the allusion in the text is based on a speech of Governor Pennypacker's at a meeting of a German society, in which he is reported to have said that Belgium was to blame for what happened to her and compared her to a man who "to assert his right to the highway" stands in the middle of the street, "directly in the route of the automobile"! Born, Phoenixville, Pa., 1843 228, 270
- PORTER, STEPHEN GEYER—Republican Congressman from Pittsburgh, Pa.; member of the Allegheny Bar. Born, Ohio, 1869 245
- POWELL, E. ALEXANDER—Author; editor; journalist; war correspondent; has been in the diplomatic service; charg 

- d'affaires at Alexandria, Egypt, 1907-08; as magazine writer and special correspondent was in Persian and Turkish revolutions; in Central Asia, 1909; Mexico, 1910; Arabia and Central Africa, 1910-11; Balkans, 1912; Mexican revolution, 1913; author of "The Last Frontier," "Gentlemen Rovers," "The End of the Trail." Born, Syracuse. N. Y., 1879 109
- POWYS, JOHN COWPER**—M.A., Corpus Christi College, Oxford (honors in History, 1893); staff lecturer on literature for Oxford University Extension Delegacy; of the Education Department Free City of Hamburg; University lecturers' Association, New York; lecturer on "The History of Liberty," a course beginning with "The Athenian Republic" and ending with "The Republic of the Future"; also lectures on "Representative American Writers," etc. 23, 69, 185, 254, 352, 356, 359
- PRINCE, DR. MORTON**—Physician; distinguished psychiatrist; A.B., Harvard, 1875, M.D., 1879; Professor of Nervous Diseases, Tufts College Medical School; author of "Nature of Mind and Human Automatism," "Dissociation of a Personality," etc. Born, Boston, 1854. 108-13, 281
- PUTNAM, GEORGE HAVEN**—Publisher, Author; ex-Union soldier; President, G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York. Born, London, 1844 218, 238-39
- RAMSAY, SIR WILLIAM**—Professor of Chemistry, University College, London, 1887-1913; now Professor Emeritus; recipient of degrees from and honorary membership in many of the learned societies of the world; author of "Argon, a New Constituent of the Atmosphere" (in conjunction with Lord Rayleigh), "Nellium, a Constituent of Certain Minerals," "Neon, Krypton and Xenon, three New Atmospheric Gases." Born, Glasgow, 1852 313, 317
- REPPLIER, AGNES**—One of the best known and most brilliant of American essayists; Litt.D. (Hon.), University of Pennsylvania, 1902. Born, Philadelphia, 1857. 41, 248, 257-63
- REVENTLOW, COUNT ERNST ZU**—Naval Writer; author of works on the Russo-Japanese War, the German Navy, England's Sea-power, World Peace or World War, etc. Born, Germany, 1867 392, 396, 400, 424, 464
- RHINELANDER, PHILIP MERCER**—Bishop of Pennsylvania; A.B., Harvard, 1891. Born, Newport, R. I., 1869 237

- RIDDER, HERMAN—Journalist; established "Katholisches Volksblatt," 1878; "Catholic News," 1886; became trustee, treasurer and manager of New York "Staats-Zeitung" in 1890 and President in 1907. Born, New York 1851, of German parents 17, 214-15, 245-46, 302
- ROHRBACH, DR. PAUL—Author, and Specialist on Colonial Administration, etc. Born, Livonia, 1869 292
- ROLLAND, ROMAIN—Author, Man of Letters; ex-Professor of the History of Art at l'Ecole Normale Superieure; inaugurated the teaching of the History of Music at the Sorbonne; one of the directors of l'Ecole des Hautes Etudes Sociales. Born, Clamecy, 1866 68
- ROOSEVELT, THEODORE—Twenty-sixth President of the United States; elected Vice-President for term 1901-05; succeeded to Presidency on death of William McKinley, September 14, 1901; elected President, November 8, 1904, by the largest popular majority ever accorded a candidate; author, soldier, hunter, traveller, explorer, reformer, statesman and patriot; regarded by millions at home and abroad as better typifying American ideals than any other living individual 33, 130, 346, 419-20, 484
- SABOLEA, CHARLES, D.Ph., F.R.S.—Editor of "Everyman"; head of the French Department, University of Edinburgh 141, 169
- SAYCE, REV. ARCHIBALD HENRY—Professor of Assyriology, Oxford University, since 1891; author of numerous works on Comparative Philology and on Oriental Languages, Literature and History. Born, England, 1846 329
- SCHARFENOBT, LOUIS A. VON—Retired Captain, ex-Librarian of the Royal Military Academy; now a Berlin Professor. Born, East Prussia, 1855 104
- SCHLETTWEIN, CARL AUGUST—Owner of lands in German Southwest Africa; writer on colonial politics and policies. Born, Germany, 1866 159
- SCHMOLLER, PROFESSOR GUSTAVE VON—Political Economist and voluminous writer. Born, Germany, 1838 198, 355, 356, 464
- SHAW, BERNARD—Author; playwright; wit. As a controversialist his aim often is to attract attention and excite surprise by the use of the unexpected and the paradoxical, without regard for the seriousness of the subject.

- For this reason, in this country at least, his articles on the war have not received the notice or had the effect to which, by reason of his intellectual acumen they might otherwise have been entitled. Born, Dublin, 1856..... 331
- SHEPHEARD, WILLIAM R.—Historian; Professor of History in Columbia University. Born, Charleston, S. C., 1871.. 245
- SIGSBEE, REAR-ADMIRAL CHARLES DWIGHT, U. S. N.—Commanded the Maine until she was blown up in Havana harbor, 1898; commanded the St. Paul during Spanish-American War; was advanced three numbers in rank "for extraordinary heroism." Born, Albany, N. Y., 1845 395
- SIMONDS, FRANK H.—Journalist; A.B. Harvard; served in Spanish-American War; has been connected with the New York "Tribune," the Albany "Courier," the New York "Evening Post" and the New York "Evening Sun." Born, Concord, Mass., 1878.....474, 478
- SLOANE, WILLIAM MILLIGAN—Professor of History, Columbia University; formerly professor at Princeton; secretary to George Bancroft in Berlin, 1873-75; author of "Napoleon Bonaparte." Born, Ohio, 1850..... 270
- STEIN, DOCTOR LUDWIG—Professor of Philosophy at Berlin; author of "Leibnitz and Spinoza," "Friedrich Nietzsche," systematic treatises on philosophy, etc.; editor of various philosophical journals and of the Jewish paper, "Nord und Süd." Born, Hungary, 1859 26, 424
- STERNBURG. BARON HERMANN SPECK VON—Ex-Ambassador from Germany to the United States (1903); fought in Franco-German War; has been First Secretary of Legation at Peking; Consul-General in British India; member of Samoan Commission; Chargé d'Affaires at Belgrade, etc. Born, Leeds, England, 1852 165
- SUDEHMANN, HERMANN—Author and prolific writer. Born, East Prussia, 1857 199
- TAFT, WILLIAM H.—Twenty-seventh President of the United States, 1909-1913; was defeated as a candidate for reelection November, 1912, receiving only the electoral votes of Vermont and Utah, 8 out of 531..... 94
- THOMPSON, VANCE—Author and playwright; A.B. Princeton, 1888. Born, 1863 325
- TIRPITZ, ALFRED P. F. VON—Admiral of the German Navy;

- was made Admiral in 1903; "Gross-Admiral," 1911.
Born, Germany, 1849..... 223
- TODD, M. HAMPTON—Lawyer; Ex-Attorney General of Pennsylvania; Hon. A.M., 1900; LL.D., 1907, Washington and Jefferson College. Born, Philadelphia, 1845..... 237
- TREVELYAN, RT. HON. SIR GEORGE OTTO, BART—Educated at Harrow and Trinity College, Cambridge, scholar and Hon. Fellow of Trinity College; has been a member of various Liberal governments; nephew of Lord Macauley; author of "Life and Letters of Lord Macauley," "Early History of Charles James Fox," "George III and Charles Fox" and "The American Revolution." Born, Leicestershire, 1838 180
- TROWBRIDGE, JOHN—Rumford Professor of Applied Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; distinguished physicist; President American Academy of Arts and Sciences. Born, Boston, 1843.....318-19
- TURNER, HERBERT HALL—Professor of Astronomy, Oxford University, since 1893; Fellow New College Oxford; formerly Fellow Trinity College, Cambridge; President Royal Astronomical Society, 1903-4; author of "Modern Astronomy," etc. Born, England, 1861..... 330
- VIERECK, GEORGE SYLVESTER—Author, editor and playwright; now editor of "The Fatherland." Born, Munich, Germany, 1844.....207, 209-10, 245-46
- VILLARD, OSWALD GARRISON—A grandson of William Lloyd Garrison, the abolitionist; A.B., Harvard, 1893; editorial writer and President "N. Y. Evening Post." Born, in Wiesbaden, Germany, 1872.....26, 73
- VOLLMER, HENRY—Congressman from Iowa; lawyer; graduate of Law Department of State University of Iowa. Born, Iowa, 1867.....204, 206, 245
- WALLING, WILLIAM ENGLISH—Author; B.S., University of Chicago, 1897; wrote "Russia's Message," 1908. Born, Louisville, 1877 466
- WASHBURN, STANLEY—Journalist and war correspondent; explorer and seasoned campaigner; an eye-witness in the Russo-Japanese war and in the present war; an authority upon the Canadian Northwest; the author of a "Life of General Nogi"; a son of the late Senator Washburn, of Minnesota 334

- WEBER, LEONHARD—Professor of Physics in the University of Kiel. Born, Germany, 1848..... 75
- WEEKS, RAYMOND—Professor of Romance Languages, Columbia University; author of many philological articles. Born, Iowa, 1863..... 104
- WEIMER, ALBERT B.—Lawyer; author; A.B., Harvard, 1880; admitted to Bar of Philadelphia, 1882; author of "Railroad Law of Pennsylvania," 1894; "Corporation Law of Pennsylvania," 1897, etc. Born, Philadelphia, 1857.... 460
- WELLS, HERBERT GEORGE—Novelist; Socialist; voluminous writer; original thinker. Born, Kent, England, 1866... 139
- WELSH, HERBERT—Publicist; A.B., University of Pennsylvania, 1871; Corresponding Secretary of the Indian Rights Association; prominent as an advocate of peace and of international arbitration. Born, Philadelphia, 1871 298
- WHARTON, EDITH—Novelist and story-writer. Born, New York, 1862 133
- WHELPLEY, JAMES DAVENPORT—Author; traveler; editor; war correspondent; editor San Antonio (Texas) "Express," 1894-7; staff correspondent Spanish-American war; sent abroad on special mission, by United States government on eleven different occasions (1900-12), visiting almost every country in the world; author of "The Nation as a Land Owner," "The Problem of the Emigrant," "The Trade of the World," etc. Born, Boston, 1863 332, 429
- WHITE, HORACE—Editor, author, and journalist; for many years editor of the Chicago "Tribune," and for twenty years (1883-1903) was connected with the New York "Evening Post," much of the time as "President of the company, editorial writer and Editor-in-Chief. Born, Colebrook, N. H., 1834..... 210
- WILCOX, ELLA WHEELER—Author; editorial writer; poetess; educated at University of Wisconsin. Born, Wisconsin, 1855..... 133
- WILE, FREDERICK WILLIAM—For over seven years the chief correspondent of the London "Daily Mail," in Germany, and the Berlin correspondent of the New York "Times" and the Chicago "Tribune;" his acquaintance with German affairs is intimate; he is the author of "The Men

- Around the Kaiser," an interesting account of some of the makers of modern Germany.....462-65
- WILHELM II, THE GERMAN KAISER—Educated at the Universities of Bonn and Cassel; grandson of the late Queen Victoria of England, and nephew of the late King Edward VII; succeeded his father as King of Prussia and German Emperor in 1888; married, 1881, the Princess Augusta Victoria, duchess of Schleswig-Holstein. Born, Berlin, 1859.....52-59
- WILSON, THOMAS WOODROW—The twenty-eighth President of the United States; Ex-Governor of New Jersey; Ex-President of Princeton University; elected President, November, 1912, with a popular vote of 6,293,000, the combined votes of the other two candidates being 7,603,000..247, 364, 375, 400, 407, 412, 414, 420, 422, 425, 433, 438
- WINSOR, WILLIAM D.—A representative and esteemed ship owner of Philadelphia; a manager of the Western Saving Fund Society.....411-12
- WINTZER, WILHELM JOHANNES—Author of "The Germans in Middle and South America, Australia, Etc.," "The Germans in Tropical America." Born, Nauendorf, Germany, 1867 354, 356
- WITTE, EMIL—Ex-Editor of the "Deutsche Zeitung," of Vienna; Ex-Press attaché at the German Embassy in Washington 163
- WORKS, JOHN—United States Senator from California. Born, Indiana, 1847..... 432
- WUNDT, PROFESSOR WILHELM M.—A distinguished physiologist and psychologist. Born, Germany, 1832..... 244

GENERAL INDEX

- Administration, present in U. S.
See *United States, Wilson, State Department.*
- Adriatic, establishment of Germany on the, 473
- Aerschot, atrocities committed in, 110
- Aim, of civilized countries in future, 495 *et seq.*
- Albert, of Belgium, 86 *et seq.*
— Quoted, 276
— Tributes to, 130 to 134
- Albert of Belgium, abuse of, by Germany, 87
— Democracy of, 88
- Aliens, naturalization in U. S., 208
- Alliance, ideal, of democracies, 366 *et seq.*
- Allies, American supply of arms to, 211
— American sympathy for, 289, 341 *et seq.*, 426, 428, 503
— Attempts of Germany to foster American resentment toward, 218
— Fighting battle of democratic civilization, 362, 382, 384, 415, 502
— Help of America necessary to, 485
— Motive of, 360
— Desire of Americans for official expression of sympathy with, 376 *et seq.*
— Resistance of U. S. A. to rights of, in searching German-American ships, 416
— Sooner or later to be supported by Italy, 472
— Victory of, hoped for, 353
— What U. S. could do in aiding, 487
- Alsace-Lorraine, 28, 357, 479, 490
- Ambition, German, 147
- America. See *United States.*
- American, attitude of average, toward German propaganda, 244
— Flag, alleged misuse of, 395
— "Impudence," 218
— Mind, 183, 186
— Neutrality League, 236
— Policy, mistaken, 161
— Society for informing Germany, 27
- "American Irritation at German Apologists," 238
- Americans, discontent of over attitude of U. S., 364, 431 *et passim*
— From German viewpoint, 421
— Humiliated by position of Government, 365
— In relation to war, 359
— "America's Duty and the Rules of War," 442
— "America's Duty in Relation to the European War," 343
— "America's Silence," 422
— Ammunition, German, 462
— Anarchists, philosophical, 359
— Anarchy in Mexico, 363
— Precipitation of this war as, 367
- Anglomaniacs, 382
- Anglo-Saxon ideas, 360
- Annexations, by Germany, 34
- Anti-British campaign in America, 172, 179, 183, 224
— Anti-British feeling, 216, 333, 431
— Anti-Japanese legislation, 223
— Anti-military agitation, cleverly managed by *Vorwaerts*, 468
— Anti-Socialist press, German, indignation of, 469
- Antwerp, to belong to Germany, 24
- Apologists, German, credibility of, 289
— Misstatements of, 250 *et seq.*
— Versus the truth, 285 *et seq.*, 293 *et seq.* See also *German-Americans, Propaganda, German*
- Appeal for "fairness," 33
- Arabia, part of, to go to Rumania, 28
- Archives, Belgian, 276
- Armies, cost of, 452
- Arms and munitions of war. See *Munitions.*
- Army, German, seat of monarch's power, 151
- Art, respect of civilization for, 316
- "Aryan" episode, 412
- Atrocities, German, 99 *et seq.*, 104, 470, 501
— Surgical possibility of, 106
- Austria, 46, 367, 479, 491 *et passim*
— At close of war, 28
— Attitude toward Serbia, 261
— Demand of, upon Serbia, 472, 490

- Dream of controlling Serbia, 135
- Judgment of Court of Civilization concerning, 64
- Position of at close of six months of war, 475
- Quarrel of Italy with, 472
- Share of cost at end of war, 28
- Austria-Italian incompatibility, 473
- Austro-Germans, Italy's offense in not following, 472
- Autocracy, German, 147, 169, 178
- Bacon, Robert, 440
- Balkan States, 490
 - Ambitions, 491
- Baltic confederation, 361
- Baltic provinces, 26, 27, 29, 362
- Band, the iron, 23
- Barbarians, German, 320
- Barbarism, German, upheld, 42-3
- Relapses into, 446. See also *Atrocities*
- Bartholdt, 204, 206, 207, 209, 225, 435
- Baaserman, 198
- Bavarian army, unfair treatment of, 459, 480
- Begbie, Harold, 429
- Belfort, German annexation of, 28
- Belgian spirit, 88
- Belgians, high qualities of, 76
 - Sad plight of, 132
- Belgium, alleged agreements of, with France, 75, 263-276
 - Ambition of France for, 493
 - As foe to civilization, 439
 - At close of war, 24, 29
 - At peace, 491
 - Attitude of *Vorwaerts* toward invasion of, 468
 - Case of, supreme issue of war, 323
 - Compensation due to, 387
 - Condemnation of Germany for treatment of, 99 *et seq.*
 - "Crime" of, 264
 - Crucified for saving of nations, 840
 - Devastation of, 220
 - Division of, 27
 - Effect of U. S. refusal to sell munitions, upon, 438
 - Fighting for American ideals, 365
 - German "chivalry" toward, 272
 - Germany's criminal position in regard to, 89
 - Germany's present attitude toward, 84 *et seq.*
 - Germany's strategic railways in, 262
 - Good name of, blasted by Germany, 124
 - Incorporated in German Empire, 25
 - Incorporated in German Customs Union, 25
 - Invasion of, 126, 392, 445, 490 *et passim*
 - Neutrality of, 25, 60 *et seq.*, 66, 126, 197, 200, 241, 300, 338; *et passim*
 - Neutrality of, inalienable right to, 72
 - Neutrality of, negligible, 90
 - Neutrality of, obligation of U. S. regarding, 444
 - Not responsible, 131
 - Plans to invade in 1906, 126, 263-276
 - Prostrate under heel of invader, 490
 - Relief of, 322 *et seq.*
 - Report on German outrages in, 388
 - Representatives of, at Washington, 388
 - Restoration of, 455
 - Sacrifice of, for democratic ideals, 361
 - Tribute of Gertrude Atherton to, 134
 - Tribute of W. D. Howells, 133
 - Tribute of Jack London, 133
 - Tribute of Edith Wharton to, 133
 - Tribute of Ella Wheeler Wilcox to, 132, 133
 - War tax levied on, 324
 - Violation of neutrality of, 75 *et seq.*, 262 *et seq.*, 423, 428
- "Belgium, a New and More Wicked Assault on," 271
- Belligerent States, 366
- Belligerents, supplies to, 205, 207, 210 *et seq.*, 434
- Bernhardt, 17, 18, 27, 29, 47, 48, 49, 178, 198, 255, 464, 492
- Bernstorff, 49, 194, 198, 398, 425
- Bethman-Hollweg, 92, 96, 264, 275, 470, 472
- Bismarck, 53, 352, 403
- Black Sea, 333
- Blockade, 396, 402 *et seq.*
- Boer War, 169
- Boers, South African, 25
- Brazil, 355, 409
- Breusing, 464
- Bright, 406
- Brussels, notice posted at, 102, 103
- Bryan, Secretary, 227, 420, 425, 436, 485
- Bryce, Viscount, 20, 180, 255
- Buelow, von, diplomatist, 198
- Byron, 367
- Cables, neutralization of, 25
- Canada and the Monroe Doctrine, 93, 311
- Coveted by U. S., 162

- German invasion of, 72, 351
- Obligation of, in case of Belgium, 443
- Canadian boundary line, 384
- Capitalism, mission of, 158
- Capri, 403
- Carter, Laura Armistead, 380
- Casus belli*, 391
- Causes of war, 17, 135-137, 327
- Cavour, 357, 362, 363
- Chancellor, German. See *Bethmann-Hollweg*
- Channel coasts, neutralization of, 25
- Chemists, German and American, 326
- Chichester, Captain, 163, 180
- China, German possessions in, 357
- Invasion of, 445
- Christianity, effect upon Germans, 315
- Civil War, 396, 408, 412, 427, 428, 477
- Civil War blockade, 406
- Civilization, destruction of ideals of, 373
- Duty of citizen in relation to, 368
- No nation entitled to impose its type of, 47
- Supreme Court of, 60, 62, 64
- Verdict of jury of, concerning violation of neutrality of Belgium, 271
- German. See *Culture*
- Civilizations, inferior, 328
- Civilized countries, what should be aim of, in future, 495 *et seq.*
- Civilized warfare, violation of rules of, 446
- Citizenship, American, violation of, 230
- German, 205 *et seq.*, 215, 230
- German-American, 208
- Clark, Champ, 485, 487
- Clemenceau, his condemnation of American favoritism, 440
- Colonies, British, 27
- Disposal of Allies', 39
- German, 25, 351, 357, 475
- French, 29, 33, 34
- Colonization, German, principles of, 159
- Commerce, American, 233
- Commercialism, American, 442
- Confederation, schemes of Pan-Germanists for, 136
- Congo Free State, 27
- Contraband, American note regarding, 421
- Protests of exporters of, 408
- Copper, lack of, in Germany, 462
- Courses, two, open to U. S., 345
- Criticism of America's behavior, 431
- Crown Prince Frederick William, 54, 323, 463
- Cuba, American policy in, 169, 217
- Culpability, Germany's, Italian evidence as to, 70
- Culture, German, 39, 46, 84, 148, 263, 314 *et seq.*, 327, 355, 360, 469, 484, 499; of world, 312
- "Czarism, War Against," 468
- Dacia, episode, 407 *et seq.*, 413, 416
- Dampierre, Marquis de, 116
- Danes, pushed back by Germans, 456
- D'Annunzio, 470
- Dardanelles, 25, 333
- Davis, Jefferson, 477
- "Deadlock, gigantic," 449
- Declaration of Independence, 181, 368
- Declaration of London, 413
- Declaration of Paris, 396
- Democracies, in Federation of Nations, 366
- Democracy, Germany as, 140 *et seq.*
- Democratic liberty, 138 *et seq.*
- Dernburg, 65 *et seq.*, 125 *et seq.*, 139, 205, 243, 254 *et seq.*, 289
- "Deutschland über Alles," 32, 238 *et seq.*, 256, 282 *et seq.*, 357
- "Deutschland unter den Weltvölkern," 292
- Medrichs-Dewey incident, 163, 180
- Diplomacy, for the service of the people, 369
- German, 70
- Disarmament, 328
- Dissatisfaction, American, 365, 408 *et seq.*
- Dostolewski, 38
- Drake, 492
- Dreiklassen system, 148
- Dryander, 198
- Dumdum bullets, 251, 290
- Duty, of America in European War, 337 *et seq.*
- East Prussia, 490
- Efficiency, German, 46, 321, 322, 324, 326, 361, 409
- Overbearing, 359
- Social, 362
- Egypt, to go to Turkey, 25, 28
- Elliot, President, 196, 343
- Embargo on arms, a fatal error, 438
- Embargo, proposed, upon shipment of supplies, 434
- Ems dispatch, 352
- England, American hostility to, 426

- And her colonies, 46
- Channel coasts neutralized in time of war, 25
- Motive of, in war, 362
- Relations between U. S. and, 181. See also *Great Britain*
- "England, Chant of Love for," 382
- "English Friends, a Word with," 427
- Ethics, German, 69-70
 - International, 183, 342, 345
 - Of neutrality, 293 *et seq.*
- Eucken, 198, 243, 314, 360
- Europe, German ambitions in, 361 *et seq.*
 - Greatest battle of, since Waterloo, 475
 - Purpose of Germans to re-make, 363
 - Rearrangement of, 24
 - Reorganization of, on Teutonic lines, 27
 - To be regenerated, 455
- "Evidence in the Case," 71
- Fairness and moderation, appeal for, 83
- Fair play, love of, inherent in Anglo-Saxons, 348
- "Falsehoods about Germany," 251
- Fatherland, love of, misplaced, 248. See also *Patriotism, German*
- Fatherland*, criticism of America in, 86
- "Federation of Nations," 366
- Feudalism, failure of, 361
- Finland, 25, 27, 362
- Flag, use of American, 395
- Food supply, to Germans, possibility of U. S. A. cutting off, 487
- Foodstuffs, for Belgium, 259
 - Importation of, by Germany, 404 *et seq.*
 - Seizure of, 403
 - Shipment of, 370, 399
- Forces in field, 476
- "Forces of Evil, The," 221
- "Foundations of the XIXth Century," 36, 37
- France, channel coasts neutralized in time of war, 25
- France, chilled by American aloofness, 439
 - Conquered by German culture, 320
- Crushing military establishment of, 369
 - Duty of, 360
 - Invasion of, by Germany, 73
 - Loan to, 412
 - Motive of, in war, 362
 - Possibility of being crushed, 389
- Sister republic to U. S. A., 388
 - Surrender to Germany, 27
 - The emancipator, 455
 - Treitschke's view of, 46
 - Unenviable position of, 491
 - Unshakeable demands of, 493
 - War waged as people's war, 469
 - What peace will mean to, 479
 - Will demand vengeance, 455
- Francis Joseph, 357
- Franco-German distrust, 491
- Franco-Prussian War, 28, 63, 352, 386
- Frederick the Great, 31
- French Revolution, 368, 371
- Frobenius, 464
- Furness, Horace Howard, 220
- Furor Teutonicus, 170, 176
- Future, the, belongs to Germany, 46
- Galician campaign, 335
- Garibaldi, 357, 363
- "German-American Diplomacy, Ten Years of," 163
- German-American interests, 217
- German-American League, National, 227
- "German-American Menace," 186
- German-American writers, 33
- German-Americans, 17, 115, 187, 190, 392, 448
 - Advice to, 225
 - Anglicising of, 158
 - Attitude of, toward this war, 171
 - Author's attitude toward, 188
 - Classes of, 172
 - Discontent of, over attitude of U. S. A., 431
 - Duty of, to Germans, 458
 - Faithful to Germany, 209
 - Organization of, 487
 - Quotations from, 76
 - Support of unneutral measures, 234
 - Supported by Irish-Americans, 432
 - Urging embargo on shipment of supplies, 434
- German Government, confidence of Germans in, 160
- Held accountable for atrocities, 121
- "German Lesson at the Front," 110
- "German Methods of Conducting the War," 257
- German people, friendship of U. S. A. for, 428
 - Lovers of peace, 466 *et seq.*
 - Superiority of, 199 *et seq.*
 - Unanimous in support of government, 175, 459-471
 - Views of, 80, 31
- German race, 36, 37

- "German religion," 37
- German ships, interned in American ports, 407
- German societies in U. S., 209, 215, 229
- German soldier, acquittal of, 121
- German Southwest Africa, 475
- German statements, irreconcilable, 300
- German superiority, 44 to 51 *et passim*
- German University League, 219
- German viewpoint, 108 *et seq.*
- "German War Book," 122
- "Germania Triumphans," 356
- Germans, deceiving words of, 369
 - Ridiculed by French, 327
 - Seen by foreigner, 313
 - Universal distaste for, in Europe, 313
- Germany, ambitions of, 22, 36
 - American attitude towards, 350 *et seq.*
 - As ideal democracy, 311
 - Attempts of, to foster trouble between Great Britain and U. S. A., 213
 - Attitude of America toward, 195
 - Attitude toward U. S. A. neutrality, 439
 - Colonies of. See *Colonies*
 - Condemnation of her treatment of Belgium, 99 *et seq.*
 - Condemnation of atrocities of, by Americans, 116
 - Crushing of military power of, 370
 - Culpability of, 60 *et seq.*
 - Debt of America to, 325
 - Debt to America, 325
 - Debt of world to, 316
 - Declaration of "war zone," 390 *et seq.*
 - Defence of invasion of Belgium, 263 *et seq.*
 - Demands of victorious, 24 *et seq.*
 - Described by Dernburg, 140
 - Desire of, to organize Europe, 361
 - Destiny of, 20
 - Doomed to defeat, 457
 - Economic preparedness of, 453
 - Fanatical faith of, 491
 - Forced alliance between England and Russia, 458
 - Forced to war, 439
 - Fundamental purpose of, in war, 468
 - Great country gone wrong, 185
 - Helplessness of, without navy, 487
 - History of, 143 *et seq.*
 - Intentions of, regarding Belgium, 95
 - Intentions of, regarding South America, 351
 - Judgment of Court of Civilization concerning, 64
 - Manner of conducting war, 219, 393 *et seq.*
 - Mental condition of. See *Megalomania*
 - Method of declaring war in, 367
 - Mind of, 492
 - Mission of, 39, 46
 - Motto of, in war, 255
 - Must be defeated, 344
 - Now comprehended by world, 458
 - Obsolescent system of, 344
 - Organized press of, abroad, 231
 - Part in political world, 27
 - Peaceful aims of, 25
 - Plea of "necessity," 405
 - Position of, at close of six months of war, 475
 - Possibility of peace for, 479
 - Possibility of starvation in, 477
 - Purpose of, in the war, 362
 - Reliability of statements of, 250 *et seq.*
 - Reorganization of Europe by, 27
 - Supply of arms in recent wars, 436
 - To be defeated by economic pressure, 452
 - Twofold policy toward U. S. A., 162 *et seq.*
 - Unproductiveness of, 330
 - Victory of, 353
 - Violation of international regulations, 441
 - Violation of laws and customs of war, 333, 372
 - Violation of solemn contract, 500
 - Violation of treaty with U. S. A., 344
- "Germany and the Next War," 20
- "Germany, the Evolution of Modern," 292
- "Germany, Triumphant," 505
- "Germany, Truth About," 251
- Germany's "Swelled Head," 86 *et seq.*
- "Germany's Answer," 260
- Giacosa, Piero, 243
- "Gigantic Deadlock," 449
- God, of Germans, 55
- Goethe, 34, 318, 319
- Goschen, Sir E., telegram to, 91
- Government, representative, 168
- Granville, Lord, 90
- Great Britain, as protector of Norway, 456
- Attitude of U. S. A. toward, 194

- Attitude toward U. S. A. in war, 439
- Demands of victorious Germany upon, 25
- Dependence of, upon munitions from U. S. A., 435
- Exceeding her rights with regard to neutral nations, 398
- Fighting for American ideals, 365
- Friendship of, for U. S. A., 163, 180, 383, 408
- German boasts concerning, 383
- Germany's policy regarding, 219
- In relation to invasion of Belgium, 264 *et seq.*
- In relation to peace, 479, 491
- Invasion of, 27
- Judgment of, on attitude of America, 444
- "Moral decay" of, 40
- Protest of U. S. A. to, 412
- Right of, to defend advantage, 431
- Stand of, on U. S. A. shipping, 402 *et seq.*
- U. S. A. neutrality favorable to, 424
- Greater Germany, Kaiser's view of, 36
- Greater Servia, idea intolerable to Austria, 260
- Grey, Sir Edward, 91
- Grivegnée, proclamation posted at, 101
- Grotius, 363, 404
- "Grudges," America not home of, 180
- Guesde, 469 *et seq.*
- Guild, Curtis, 440
- Gunpowder, supply of, a grave anxiety in Germany. See also *Munitions of War*
- Gwinner, von, 198
- Hæckel, 198, 314, 360
- Hague Conferences, The, 337 *et seq.*, 344 *et seq.*, 359, 418, 421, 428, 441
- Broken pledges of, 250
- Regulations of war formulated in, 373
- Violation of, 444 *et seq.*
- Hague Tribunal, The, 366
- Hamilton, Alexander, 72, 436
- Hampden, John, 363
- Harnack, 198, 360
- Harden, Maximilian, 195
- "Hate, Chant of," 307
- Hatred, German world, 371
- Heeringen, von, 325
- Heine, 314, 315
- Heredity, influence of, 173
- Hexamer, Charles, 176
- Hibben, President, 244
- Hitchcock, Senator, 432
- Hohenzollern dynasty, 143 *et seq.*
- Holland, 342, 490
- Coasts of, neutralized in time of war, 25
- Respect of Germany for, 96
- Holleben, von, 164, 166, 167
- Humanity, characteristic of civilized man, 316
- Leadership of, 47
- Hurt, possibility of, to Americans, 485
- Huxley, 330
- Hypocrisy, Anglo-Saxon, charge of, 69
- German, 67-68
- Ideal, American, 196, 359
- "Idealism as a Practical Creed," 369
- Idealism, European respect for, 420
- Ideals, American, 196
- Democratic, 361
- Democratic, of English-speaking people, 180
- German, 57, 159, 196
- Of Allies, 484
- Prussian, 169
- Idea, of liberty, behind war, 360
- Indemnities, 29, 258
- Indemnity, to be demanded by Germany, 28
- Independence Hall, 383
- Inquiry, Belgian Commission of, 103
- Insanity, German. See *Megalomania*
- Instinctive beauty, 359
- Instinctive faith, 359
- Insurance, social, 370
- "Intellectual Moratorium, An," 329
- "Intellectuals," German, 280 *et seq.*, 463
- Interests, of America, in the war, 350 *et seq.*
- International court, 369, 498
- International justice, duty of America to promote, 386
- International law, 61, 337, 342, 372, 441, 444 *et seq.*
- Necessity of, controlling declaration and inauguration of war, 367
- New, for benefit of single belligerent, 438
- Obligation of U. S. to defend, 422 *et seq.*
- International matters, need of judge in, 495
- International police, 366, 495
- Intervention, American, what could be accomplished by, 435, 487 *et seq.*
- Question of American, in war, 338 *et seq.*
- Necessity of, 375

- Technical justifications for American, 488
- Inventions, American, 325, 328
- Inventiveness, German, 316, 325
- Irish-Americans, 190, 409
- Supporting German-Americans, 482
- "Is President Wilson Pro-German?" 412
- Islamism, 329
- Italy, 46
- Announcement of neutrality, 473
- Attitude toward war, 471 *et seq.*
- Duty of, 360
- Expense of maintaining neutrality, 474
- Tempted by Allies, 474
- Her duty of disclosure, 63
- Neutrality of, 243
- Probable entrance of, into war, 477
- Support of neutrality by *Vorwaerts*, 468
- Japan, attitude of German-Americans toward, 187
- Duty of, 360
- German attempts to sow discord between U. S. A. and, 222 *et seq.*
- Influence of, in Manchuria, 25
- Love of U. S. A. for, 409
- Japanese-Russian War, 412
- Jefferson, 436
- Joan of Arc, 52
- Jones, Sir Henry, 369
- Kaiser, 18, 19, 51-59, 340, 342, 355, 365, 463, 408
- Ambition for Greater Germany, 36
- As symbol of State, 59
- Author's opinion of the, 52
- Belief of, in his Divine appointment, 52
- Birthday congratulations of American people, 390
- Delirium of grandeur of, 53
- Ferocious exhortations of, 244
- Greeting to Military Society, 166
- Howells' view of the, 53 *et seq.*
- Megalomania of, 52, 58
- Mental condition of, 52
- Message of to Crown Princess, 54
- Middle-ear disease of, 52
- Neuropsychopathic, 52
- Personal responsibility for war, 51
- Possibility a paranoiac, 52
- Quoted, 39
- Served by blundering officials, 457

- Speeches of, 56, 57, 58, 466
- Supported by German people, 175
- Telegram of, on August 1st, 73
- War constantly in mind of, 57
- Keim, 464
- "King Albert's Book," 132
- Kinkel, Gottfried, 363
- Klent, testimony of German atrocities, 119
- Koch, 330
- Koester, von, 464
- Komura, Marquis, 221
- Kriegsstaat, 169
- Kultur. See *Culture*
- Lamprecht, 198
- Language, in relation to conquest, 41
- German, to be forced on world, 40
- World, German as, 201
- Lenard, Doctor, 51
- Lentz, John J., 165
- Leon, 209
- Liberal government, The, 421
- Liberty, as basis of State, view of Allies, 454
- Individual, desire for, as basis of war, 359 *et seq.*
- Motive of Allies, 502
- Spencer's theory regarding, 368
- Liege, proclamation to municipal authorities of, 100
- Lincoln, 363, 367, 484
- Lincoln's Gettysburg speech, 371
- Literature, German, 145, 314
- Lobeck, 204, 206, 207, 209
- Lodge, Senator, 407, 411
- London, occupation of, by Germany, 27
- Losses, 453, 476, 490
- Louvain, destruction of, 112, 202, 219, 258
- Love, of Germans of French and Belgians, 43
- Lusitania, 395
- Luxemburg, indemnity paid by Germany for violation of neutrality, 324
- Violation of neutrality of, 423, 445
- Machiavelli, 18, 62
- Machtpolitik*, 361
- Madness. See *Megalomania*
- Maeterlinck, 470
- Magna Charta, 368
- Manchuria, Japanese influence in, 25
- Marlborough, 492
- Marne, battle of, 475
- Mazzini, 363
- Medicine, discoveries in, not German, 318

- Megalomania, German, 35 *et seq.*, 44 *et seq.*, 47 *et seq.*, 185, 484, 499
 Men in field, 476
 Mental processes, German, 202
 Mercantile interests, American, 422
 Merchant marine, American, 228, 282
 Metals, maximum price of, fixed by Bundesrath, 461
 Metternich, 362
 Mexico, 409
 — Anarchy in, 373
 — Embargo upon shipment of arms into, 434
 Meyer, Kuno, 190 *et seq.*
 Militarism, check of, 491
 — Defense of, 30, 31, 32
 — Duty of democratic states in relation to, 369
 — German, 21, 22, 46, 138 *et seq.*, 171, 196, 199, 308, 324, 327, 360, 457
 — Nightmare of, 493
 — Prejudice to spreading culture by, 327
 — To be crushed, 455
 — World not willing to consent to truce with, 493
 — Worship of, 174
 "Military Necessity," 397
 Mines, right to plant, 391
 — Protest against laying, 428
 Mobilization, German, 78
 Mohammed, 327
 Moltke, General von, 73
 Monarchical idea, 502
 Monarchies, in Federation of Nations, 367
 — Procedure of, in war, 367
 Money, expenditure of, in war, 449
 Monroe Doctrine, 25, 93, 95, 157, 284, 311, 350, 353 *et seq.*, 358, 409
 — In regard to Canada, 93, 311,
 — In regard to Cuba, 217
 — German attitude toward, 162
 Monuments, protest against destruction of, 428
 Moral interests, of U. S. A. in infractions of law of nations, 446
 Morals. See *Ethics*
 Morocco, German annexation of, 25;
 Morgan, J. P. & Co., 412
 Munitions of war, American export of, 232, 233, 236, 237
 — European precedent for American position regarding, 436
 — Manufacture of and sale of, 436
 — Refusal to sell to Allies, 210 *et seq.*
 Münsterberg, 18, 22, 52, 181 *et seq.*, 198, 254, 255, 360
 Murder, mathematics of, 477
 Music, German, 330
 Namur, notice posted at, 100
 Napoleon, 18, 443
 Naturalization, of aliens in U. S., 208
 — Of Germans in U. S., 187
 Necessity, for more room, German plea of, 69
 — Plea of, for violation of Belgium, 68, 70
 Nelson, 492
 Neutral nations, example of U. S. A. to, 504
 — German condemnation of, 43
 Neutral shipping, 394 *et seq.*
 Neutral states, 366, 372
 Neutrality, American, 439
 — Attitude of German-Americans toward, 187
 — "Dollar," of U. S., 432
 — Ethics of, 293 *et seq.*
 — Economic burden of, in case of Italy, 474
 — Italy's announcement of, 473
 — Obligation to positive action, 422
 — Official, 407
 — Passive, 439
 — Violation of, by author, 235. See also *Belgium* and *United States*
 Neutrality leagues, 227, 232, 236, 244
 "Neutrality, Legal Versus Moral," 335
 New York Peace Society, 496
 Newspapers. See *Press*
 Nietzsche, 34, 198, 253, 319, 370
 Nitrates, lack of, in Germany, 462
 Nitrogenous salts, supply of, important to Germany, 461
 Nobility, lack of, in Germany, 159
 North Sea, 121, 391. See also *War Zone*
 Norway, integrity of, 456
 Opinion. See *Public Opinion*
 Opinions, general, justified by evidence, 499 *et seq.*
 Opportunity, favorable for Triple Alliance, 136
 Opposing forces, principles represented by the, in the war, 138 *et seq.*
 "Orange Paper," 62 *et seq.*
 "Order in Council," British, 402 *et seq.*
 Organization of Germans in U. S. A., 190 *et seq.*
 Ostwald, Prof., 363
 Outcome of war, 24 *et seq.*, 448 *et seq.*
 Pacific, American naval supremacy in, 157

- Pan-German campaign, 215
 — Literature, 45
 — Prophets, 354
 — "Pan-Germanism," 135
 Pan-Germans, quotations from, 30-31
 — War inspired by, 499
 Paris, German culture dependent on, 320
 Pasteur, 330
 Patriotism, German, 45, 176, 230, 453
 — Condemnation of, by *Vorwärts*, 468
 Peace, American championship of, 156 *et seq.*
 — Abandonment of neutrality to secure, 429
 — Conditions of permanent, 496
 — Dangers of, 30, 31
 — Democracies committed to, 367
 — Distant, 474
 — German patriotism, obstructions to, 453
 — Sort of, desirable, 483, 484
 — Sought by England, France, Italy and Russia, 65
 — Not sufficient desire for, 479
 — Possible on two bases, 478
 — Treitschke's view of, 21
 — Undesirability of inconclusive, 482
 — Universal, 328
 — Vision of, 489 *et seq.*
 — Value of, to contestants, 478
 — What Americans can do to help bring about, 481 *et seq.*, 485
 Peace of Righteousness, World League for, 495
 Peace party, in Germany, 465
 Peace Society, New York, 496
 Peculiarity, racial or tribal, 172
 Persian Gulf, 25
 Philippines, 163, 180, 354
 Philistines of culture, 320
 Philosophy, German, war as outcome of, 387
 Place in the sun, Germany's, 23
 Poland, 25, 27, 29, 38
 — Overrun by troops, 490
 — Russian armies in, 334
 — Russian proposals concerning, 333
 Poles regarded as helots, 38
 Police duty, of navies of France and Great Britain, 370
 Police, international, 366, 495
 Polish press, 38
 Polish societies, 38
 Political ideals, of Germany and U. S. in conflict, 158
 Politics, American, influenced by war conditions, 247
 Population, of Germany, problem of, 292
 Possibilities, tragic, of war, 340
 Poverty, anomaly of, 353
 — As consequence of war, 462
 Prayer, of German Church for victory, 54
 Present time, reason why selected by Germany for war, 135 *et seq.*
 President of U. S. A. See *Wilson, President*
 Press, American, anti-German attitude of, 165
 — Danger of, German influence on, 193
 — German condemnation of, 234
 — Irritating to Germany, 424
 — Voicing real attitude of nation, 429
 Press, foreign, prejudice against Germany, 208 *et seq.*
 Press, German, attitude toward protest of neutral nations, 397
 — Comment on American stand in shipping question, 399 *et seq.*
 — In United States, 165 *et seq.*
 — Liberty of, 161
 Press, German-American, 165, 432, 433
 — "Prevention of War, The," 366
 Principles at stake, 484
 — Underlying war, 138 *et seq.*
 Professors, appointment of, at German universities, 50
 — English, reply of, to Germans, 66
 — German, loyalty of, 277 *et seq.*
 — Influence of, 279
 Pro-German propaganda. See *Propaganda, German*
 Propaganda, German, aims of, in America, 190 *et seq.*
 — Effect of, 228 *et passim*
 Proposal for peace, Grey to Goshen, 91
 Protest, against violation of rules of civilized war, 372
 — American against repudiation of principles of international law regulating shipping, 398
 — Of Kaiser to President Wilson, 301
 — Of U. S. A., 446
 — "Psychological" moment for, 375
 Prussia, domination of in Germany, 355
 Public opinion, German against U. S. A., 439
 — American, 244, 254, 256, 380, 439
 — American, concerning violation of neutrality of Belgium, 271
 — American, efforts to influence, 501

- American, from German view-point, 421
- American, "hypocrisy" of, 425
- German, 19, 454
- Punishment, vicarious, 373
- Purpose, underlying, of this war, 170
- Radicals, 359
- Railways, German in Belgium, 275
- Reich, Emil, 36 *et seq.*, 325
- Reichstag, membership in, at end of war, 29
- Representative government, 138 *et seq.*
- Research, German, 326
- Reventlow, 464
- Revolution, materialistic, 361
- Possibility of German, 143, 153
- Revolutionists, German, 471
- Rheims, destruction of Cathedral of, 259, 298
- Rights of man, democracies committed to, 367
- Roman Catholic Irish, 426
- Roosevelt, 33, 130, 346, 419, 484
- Root, Elihu, 157
- Rulers, German, 143 *et seq.*
- Rumania, to receive part of Arabia, 28
- Probable entrance of, into war, 477
- Russia, 46, 367, 491 *et passim*
- Ambitions of, 332 *et seq.*
- American loan to, 412
- Conditions in, preceding war, 468
- Dependence of, upon munitions from U. S., 435
- Dismemberment of, at end of the war, 28
- Duty of, to Polish, Finnish and Jewish subjects, 360
- Fighting for American ideals, 365
- Motive of, in war, 362
- Possibility of her failing to keep promises, 370
- Relation of, to war, 332 *et seq.*
- Responsible for the war, 66
- Share of, in war, 334 *et seq.*
- Spirit of war, 334 *et seq.*
- To be rendered impotent, 27
- What peace will mean to, 479
- "Russian peril," 468
- Russo-Turkish War, 396
- Saltpeter, Germany deprived of import of, 461
- Lack of, in Germany, 462
- Scandinavian countries, 362
- Scarborough, raid on, 123
- Schleswig-Holstein, 357, 456
- Schmoller, von, 198
- Schurz, Carl, 357, 362, 363
- Schutz und Trutz*, 232, 233
- Science, German, 315
- "Scrap of paper," 62, 96, 300, 339, 352, 398; Dr. Dillon's book, 71
- Sea, losses at, 449
- "Secret papers," 264 *et seq.*
- "Secret treaties," 264 *et seq.*
- Self-preservation, instincts of, 360
- Self-protection, three methods of national, 497
- Sembat, 469
- Servia, Austria's attempt to sand-bag, 472
- To go to Austria, 28
- Seydel, von, 152
- Sheridan, John P., 191
- Ship-purchase bill, 407, 409 *et seq.*
- Ships, German, interned in American ports, 411 *et seq.*
- Sigsbee, 395
- "Silence, America's," 422
- "Slav Peril," 332 *et seq.*
- Slavery, failure of, 361
- Slavonic ideas, 360
- Social Democrats, 153, 467
- Social instinct, lack of, in German culture, 314
- Socialism in Germany, 151, 177, 467 *et seq.*
- Socialist literature, admitted to barracks, 470
- Socialists, attitude of German, toward war, 468
- Socialists in Italy, 472
- Soldiers' societies, German, in U. S. A., 166
- South African revolution, 475
- South America, German expansion in, 94
- German intentions regarding, 351, 354, 358
- Republics of, 362, 369
- Spain, loss of Cuba, 217
- Spanish-American War, 217 *et seq.*, 230, 396, 408
- Speech, freedom of, in neutral America, 192
- Spencer, Herbert, 368
- Starvation, 310
- State Department, attitude toward "Aryan" episode, 412
- Concessions with regard to methods of warfare, 403
- Notes of, 399
- State, the Allies' view of, 454
- German view of, 43, 174, 179, 454
- Ideal of, 31
- Nietzsche's conception of, 253
- Salvation through, 369
- Steuben, 362
- Strike, eve of, in Russia, 468
- Suderman, 199
- Suez Canal, to go to Turkey at end of war, 29

- Summary of views, 499 *et seq.*
 Supplies, of Germany, efficiently managed, 453
 — Proposed embargo upon shipment of, 434
 — To belligerents, 205, 207, 210 *et seq.*
 "Supreme Court of Civilization," 60
 Supreme Court of U. S., 436
 Survival of fittest, 32
 Sweden, to be united with Finland, 27
 — To receive Poland, 28
 Sympathy, American, for Allies, 173
 — American, for Germany, 324
 Taylor, ex-President, of Vassar College, 188
 "Teutonic idea," 168
 Teutonic race, superiority of, 184
 Theocracy, failure of, 361
 "Thinking, German and Other," 195
 Trade, ambitions of Germany for, 370
 Traffic in arms, American, 432 *et seq.*
 Transfer of ships, 413. See also *Ship-purchase bill.*
 Treaties, concerning neutrality, general considerations regarding, 79
 — Hague, to be regarded, 345
 — Instances of breaking of, 78
 — Of 1870, 79 *et seq.*, 82, 90
 — Secret, 264 *et seq.*
 Treitschke, 17 *et seq.*, 29, 198, 230, 369
 "Triumphant Germany," 505
 "Truth about Germany, The," 35, 250, 277, 313
 Truth, no concern of state, 263
 Turk, disaster to, 476
 Turkey, left to her fate, 479
 — Relations of with Germany, 25
 — Share of cost at end of war, 28
 — To receive tolls from Suez Canal, 29
 Undergraduates, of German universities, 464
 Unfairness, complaints of, regarding Germany's case, 250
 United States, abandonment of neutrality, 429
 — As arbiter between Great Britain and Germany, 420, 424
 — As custodian of the rights of neutrals, 418
 — As "melting pot," 228
 — Attitude of Administration in war, 488, 502
 — Attitude of Germany toward, 156
 — Baffling attitude of, 388
 — Championship of peace, 156 *et seq.*
 — Change of opinion in, 26
 — Commercial interest in war, 444
 — Commercialism in, 443
 — Convicted of cowardice and complicity in crime, 443
 — Debt of, to England and France, 343
 — Debt of Germany to, 325
 — Debt to Germany, 325
 — Detachment of, 418
 — Duties of, in relation to European War, 337 *et seq.*
 — Duties of, to rest of world, 364
 — Duty of, 371, 419, 442
 — Duty to support Allies, 485 *et seq.*
 — Effect of official attitude on Americans, 364 *et seq.*
 — Effect on other peoples, 417 *et seq.*
 — Efforts of German-Americans to bulldoze, 225
 — Favoring of Germany by Ship-purchase bill, 407
 — German attempts to sow discord between Japan and, 222 *et seq.*
 — Government compared with German, 160
 — High rôle of, 389
 — Hope of author for, 505
 — Impairment of moral authority of, 373
 — Importance of present course, 447
 — In case of German invasion, 72
 — Interests of, in the war, 350 *et seq.*
 — Land of commercialism, 442
 — Land of liberty, 442
 — League for maintaining neutrality of, 227, 232 *et seq.*
 — Making no real friends in war, 440
 — Military status of, 158
 — Neutrality of, 176, 187, 212 *et seq.*, 226, 243 *et seq.*, 337 *et seq.*, 365, 407, 415, 426, 435
 — Poem of Miss Carter regarding neutrality of 380
 — Policy of neutrality, 415
 — Policy in Cuba, 217
 — Political aims of, 156
 — Obligation regarding Belgium, 338
 — Open breach of neutrality, 407
 — Real grievance of, 503
 — Spirit of, 384
 — Subsequent conquest of, 18, 19
 — Supplies to belligerents, 205, 207, 210 *et seq.*

- Sympathy of, with Allies, 428, 508
- Sympathy of, with Great Britain, 427
- Technical grievance of, 503
- "True neutrality" of, 435
- What could be accomplished by intervention of, 487 *et seq.*
- What might be done by, 348
- University system, German, 50, 152, 277, 464
- Unrest, American, 365, 408 *et seq.*
- German, 152 *et seq.*
- Vessels, neutral, right of search, 398 *et seq.*, 407
- Victory, for militarism or peace, 189
- Of Allies, what it would mean, 347, 353, 357
- Of Germany, what it would mean, 347, 353, 354, 356 *et seq.*
- Villa, 484
- Violation of international regulations, 441
- Of rules of war, 338, 372
- Of treaties, 344, 500
- Vollmer, 204, 206, 207, 209
- Vorwaerts, attitude of, toward war, 467 *et seq.*
- War, advocated for America, 341 *et seq.*
- Anomaly of, 353
- As biological necessity, 32, 483
- As work of God, 199
- Attitude of German people toward, 465
- Biggest issue of, 441
- Biological necessity of, 32, 483
- Blessings of, 30, 31, 32
- Causes of, 17, 327
- Civil, danger of, in event of outbreak between Germany and U. S. A., 167
- Cost of armies of, 451
- Cult of, German, 371
- Duration of, 449 *et seq.*, 462, 475, 478, 479
- Explanation of, 49
- Favorable opportunity for general European, 136
- Forced upon Germany, 439
- German purpose in, 355
- German rules of, 122
- How precipitated, 500
- Hypocrisy of, unveiled, 107
- Laws and customs of, 337 *et seq.*
- Levies, in Belgium, 323
- Modern, international law regarding, 445
- Methods of present, 372
- Most gigantic ever recorded, 455
- Necessity of law controlling, 367
- Political idealism dependent on, 21
- Possible outcome of, 24 *et seq.*, 448 *et seq.*
- Possibility of ending, by withholding war material, 435
- Prevention of, 366
- Principles underlying present, 138 *et seq.*
- Procedure of monarchies in, 367
- Real beginning of, 454, 456
- Real issue of, 492
- Responsibility for, 18, 70
- Rules of, 442
- Sacredness of, 464
- Untold horror of, 489
- Why precipitated by Germany at present time, 135 *et seq.*
- "War against Czarism," 468
- "War and America. The," 181
- "War, German Methods of Conducting the," 257
- "War is War," 186
- War Lord, 90, 341, 484
- War of 1812, 384
- Party in Germany, 463 *et seq.*
- "War, the American versus the German Viewpoint of," 108
- "War Zone," 342, 390 *et seq.*, 487
- Warfare, advocacy of, 33
- German methods of, 374
- Washington, George, 363, 364, 484
- "Watchful waiting," 351, 488
- Wavre, letter addressed to burgo-master of, 101
- Wealth of European nations, 452
- Wellington, 492
- "Weltmacht oder Niedergang," 32
- Westminster Abbey, 383
- "What should America Learn from War," 495
- "When Germany Wins," 23, 24, 25, 27, 28
- "White Papers," 35, 62 *et seq.*
- White Paper, British, 91, 93, 95
- Wilhelm I., 58
- Wilhelm II. See *Kaiser*
- Wilhelmina, 398 *et seq.*
- Wilson, President, 225, 226, 227, 247, 347, 397, 420, 425, 433, 434, 438, 447
- Admonitions of, as to neutrality, 486
- As peace-maker, 421
- Author's criticism of, 410
- Duty of protest, 342
- Efforts in support of Ship-purchase bill, 410 *et seq.*
- His congratulation of Emperor William criticized, 390
- Ideals of, 364
- Impossibility of compliance with his request, 386 *et seq.*
- Neutrality of, 213
- Pro-German attitude of, 412

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>Wisdom, German, 23
 "Wistar, Sallie," 106
 Woltman, Ludwig, 37
 Women, attitude of German to-ward, 313
 Word, value of to civilized man, 316
 "Word with our English Friends, A," 427</p> | <p>Works, Senator, 432
 World League for Peace of Righteousness, 495
 World Power, German, 17, 350, 371, 499
 — Prussian idea of, 355
 "World War and Its End," 27, 28
 "Yellow Peril," 223</p> |
|--|---|

1-211

THE BORROWER WILL BE CHARGED
AN OVERDUE FEE IF THIS BOOK IS NOT
RETURNED TO THE LIBRARY ON
BEFORE THE LAST DATE STAMPED
BELOW. NON-RECEIPT OF OVERDUE
NOTICES DOES NOT EXEMPT THE
BORROWER FROM OVERDUE FEES.

WIDENER
BOOKS
NOV 8 1982
19674
CALLED



H 793.714.4

A text-book of the war for American

Widener Library

001872226



3 2044 087 982 302